AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN THE BOOK OF BARUCH

by

Joseph John Battistone

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: May 30, 1968

Approved:

W.F. Stinespring, Supervisor

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1968

ABSTRACT

(Biblical Studies)

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN THE BOOK OF BARUCH

by

Joseph John Battistone

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: May 30, 1968

Approved:

W.F. Stinespring
W.F. Stinespring, Supervisor

Arnold Wuttenauer

R. Moody Smith Jr.

Gene M. Tucker

Wm Willis

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1968

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN THE BOOK OF BARUCH

by

Joseph John Battistone

The purpose of the dissertation was to examine the literary and theological background of the wisdom passage in the book of Baruch by treating, on the one hand, the questions of authorship and date, and, on the other hand, the themes and concepts alluded to in the Old Testament.

Evidence was advanced on the basis of language and style, differing viewpoints, and different subject matter, showing the book to be a composite work, emanating from several different hands. The three main divisions of the book are a confession of sins with prayers for mercy and deliverance (1:15-3:8), a passage on wisdom (3:9-4:4), and a series of poems which treat the themes of the desolation and glorification of Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). An introductory section (1:3-14) was added by a redactor, who was concerned to provide the confessions and prayers with a historical setting, as well as to emphasize the liturgical character of the material. It is doubtful that Baruch, the secretary and friend of the prophet

Jeremiah, wrote any portion of the book attributed to him.

Owing to the fact that the materials offer no definite clues as to the time of composition, the various dates assigned can be at best only tentative. A distinction was made between the date of the composition of the wisdom passage, and the time when it was added to the other materials in the book. The present writer believes the probable date of composition was the early part of the second century B.C. The wisdom passage was probably joined to the other materials in the first century B.C. or the early part of the first century A.D. The main evidence for determining the date of the final form of the book has to do with the literary relationships between Bar. 1:15-3:8 and Dan. 9:5-19, and Bar. 5:1-9 and Ps. of Sol. 11:1-9. The evidence seems to favor the priority of the prayer in Daniel, on the one hand, and the material in Bar. 5:1-9, on the other hand.

In the examination of the theological background of the wisdom passage consideration was given to three basic themes: (1) The question of the accessibility of wisdom, (2) Wisdom and creation, and (3) Wisdom and the Torah. In the formulation of his message, the author drew material from the books of Genesis, Deuteronomy, Job and Isaiah. The thesis that wisdom is found only in Israel is peculiar to the wisdom passage in Baruch, but the theological antecedents of this view can be seen in the Old Testament passages where the wisdom of Israel is compared with the wisdom of foreign nations, and in the attacks of the prophets against the foreign wise men, who attempt to chart a course independent of Yahweh.

The wisdom and power of God in connection with his activity as Creator constitute important factors in Baruch for the idea of his incomparability. Closely associated with the idea of God's incomparability is the concept of Israel's uniqueness. In Baruch Israel's unique relationship with God and her possession of wisdom are the factors which make the nation distinct from the peoples surrounding her.

The identification of wisdom with the Torah is seen as the culmination of a process already begun in the Old Testament, and forms the basis for the claim in Baruch that wisdom is found only in Israel.

PREFACE

An interest in the book of Baruch was awakened while reading the book of Jeremiah in a Hebrew-language course offered by Dr. Orval Wintermute at the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University. A number of writings in the literature of later Judaism were attributed to Baruch the son of Neriah. I was attracted to the apocryphal book of Baruch found in the Septuagint because of the interesting literary problems it presents.

The translations from the Old Testament, unless otherwise indicated are my own, and were based on R. Kittel's Biblia Hebraica (1959). J. Ziegler's Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae (1957) was used as the basis for the Greek readings cited from the texts of Jeremiah and Baruch, as well as the translations from the latter. The remaining Greek readings cited from the Old Testament were taken from A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (1962).

I am grateful for the awards granted to me during the school years of 1966-1967 and 1967-1968, which have made possible the continuation of my studies at Duke University. I wish to express my gratitude to Professor W.F. Stinespring for the time and interest he invested on my behalf in directing this dissertation. I am also indebted to Dr. Orval Wintermute for

his criticisms and helpful suggestions, and to Father R.E. Murphy for the help given to me in the early part of my research.

I am especially indebted to Adrienne, my wife for the patience and love shown to me, as well as her valuable help in typing the dissertation. I am also grateful to Barbara Battistone, my sister-in-law, who has assisted Adrienne in typing the dissertation.

J.J.B.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANET - Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament

BDB - Brown, Driver, Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament

CBQ - Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CCD - Confraternity of Chistian Doctrine

CJT - Canadian Journal of Theology

IB - The Interpreter's Bible

IDB - The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible

JBL - The Journal of Biblical Literature

JNES - The Journal of Near Eastern Studies

JSS - The Journal of Semitic Studies

JTS - The Journal of Theological Studies

LXX - Septuagint

MT - Masoretic Text

RSV - Revised Standard Version

SJT - Scottish Journal of Theology

SVT - Supplements to Vetus Testamentum

VT - Vetus Testamentum

ZAW - Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT		iii
PREFACE		vi
ABBREVIATIONS		viii
I.	THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP	2
II.	THE QUESTION OF DATE	47
III.	GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN BARUCH	101
IV.	THE INACCESSIBILITY OF WISDOM	112
V.	WISDOM AND CREATION	148
VI.	WISDOM AND THE TORAH	178
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	203
BIBLIOGRAPHY		211
BIOGRAPHY		222

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN THE BOOK OF BARUCH

CHAPTER I

THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP

THE PROBLEM

The book of Baruch purports to have been written by Baruch, the son of Neriah, and the friend and amanuensis of the prophet Jeremiah (Bar. 1:1).[1] The older conservative scholars, namely, R.F.R. Bellarmine,[2] G.Whiston,[3] B. Welte,[4] J.M.A. Scholz,[5] F.H. Reusch,[6] and more recently E. Kalt,[7]

---

[1]Cf. Jer. 32:12,13,16; 36:4-32; 43:1-7; 45:1-5.

[2]This information was taken from R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 412.

[3]A Dissertation to prove the Apocryphal Book of Baruch Canonical (London, 1727). This information was taken from Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

[4]This information was taken from C.F. Keil, Lehrbuch der historischkritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments (third edition; Frankfurt: Verlag von Heyder & Zimmer, 1873), p. 751.

[5]This information was taken from Keil, loc. cit.

[6]Erklärung des Buches Baruch (Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1853), pp. 21-22.

[7]Das Buch Baruch ("Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments"; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), vol. VII, part 3/4, pp. 2,5 ff.

following the claims of the introductory verses, attributed the entire book to Baruch. The greater number of scholars, however, have seriously questioned the unity of the book, considering it to be of diverse authorship; but there is a difference of opinion concerning this diversity; L. Bertholdt;[1] O.F. Fritzsche,[2] H.L. Strack,[3] C.H. Cornill,[4] R.R. Harwell,[5] H.St.J. Thackeray,[6] and C.C. Torrey[7] divide the book into two parts (1:1-3:8 and 3:9-5:9), attributing each part to differ-

---

[1]Cited from Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

[2]Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testament (Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1851), pp. 168-169.

[3]Einleitung in das Alte Testament einschliesslich Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen mit eingehender Angabe der Literatur (fourth edition, entirely revised; München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung,1895), pp. 154-155.

[4]Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen (fourth edition, completely revised; Freiburg and Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J.C.B. Mohr, 1896), pp. 272-273.

[5]The Principal Versions of Baruch (New Haven: Yale University, 1915), pp. 63-64. This work was a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Yale University. As the title of the work indicates, the dissertation is primarily centered around the text of Baruch as preserved in the Greek, Syriac and Latin manuscripts. The question of authorship is not dealt with at great length.

[6]The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins (an expanded form of the Schweich Lectures, 1920, second edition; London: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 86. Thackeray's work consists of a series of three lectures. In the third lecture the author deals with the book of Baruch, which, he concludes, was an unsuccessful rival to the book of Lamentations in the Jewish liturgical services.

[7]The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), pp. 59-60.

ent authors. J.J. Kneucker,[1] E. Schürer,[2] O.C. Whitehouse,[3] W.J. Ferrar,[4] P. Kraus,[5] W. Stoderl,[6] P. Heinisch,[7] W.O.E. Oesterley,[8] E.J. Goodspeed,[9] R.H. Pfeiffer,[10] O. Eissfeldt,[11]

---

[1]Das Buch Baruch: Geschichte und Kritik, Übersetzung und Erklärung auf Grund der wiederhergestellten hebräischen Urtextes (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1879), pp. 13-14, 16 ff., 37-61.

[2]"Apocrypha", The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, et al. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1949), I, 219.

[3]The Book of Baruch, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, edited by R.H. Charles (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913), I, 570-571.

[4]The Uncanonical Jewish Books: A Short Introduction to the Apocrypha and the Jewish Writings (London: S.P.C.K., 1918), p. 38.

[5]"Baruch-Buch", Encyclopaedia Judaica: das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart, edited by Jakob Klatzkin, I. Elbogen, et al. (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1929), vol. III, col. 1123.

[6]Zur Echtheitsfrage von Baruch 1-3,8 (Münster in Westf.: Druck der Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1922), p. 3

[7]"Die Entstehung des Buches Baruch", Theologie und Glaube XX (1928), 696-710.

[8]An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), pp. 262-263. The position taken here is basically the one stated in an earlier work entitled The Books of the Apocrypha: Their Origin, Teaching and Contents (London: Robert Scott, 1915), p. 503. Hereafter the works by Oesterley stated above will be cited as An Introduction, and The Books of the Apocrypha respectively.

[9]The Story of the Apocrypha (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 102-104.

[10]Op. cit., p. 413.

[11]The Old Testament, An Introduction: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 593-594.

A. Penna,[1] and B.N. Wambacq[2] recognize three authors,[3] while J.T. Marshall[4] believes the book was written by four hands. Others, namely, C.F. Keil,[5] W. Vatke,[6] A. Gelin,[7] B.M. Metzger[8] and J.L. McKenzie[9] acknowledge the composite nature of the book, but are less precise about assigning the various parts to different authors. A number of critics offer their opinions without presenting supporting evidence.

In addition to the question of the unity of authorship, scholarship has been divided on the question of the authenticity

---

[1]Introduction and notes on the book of Baruch, La Sacra Bibbia (Marietti Ed. Ltdl., Italy, 1963), II, 914.

[2]"L'unité du livre de Baruch", Biblica XLVII (1966), pp. 574-576.

[3]The great majority of these critics divide the book into the following parts: 1:1-3:8; 3:9-4:4; and 4:5-5:9.

[4]"Book of Baruch", A Dictionary of the Bible, edited by James Hastings, et al. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898), I, 251.

[5]Op. cit., pp. 751-752.

[6]Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Bonn: Verlag von Emil Strauss, 1886), p. 753.

[7]Jérémie. Les Lamentations. Le Livre de Baruch (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1951), p. 286.

[8]An Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 89. The book of Baruch "appears to be a composite work of uneven quality written by two or more authors...."

[9]"Baruch", Dictionary of the Bible (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965), p. 82. McKenzie refers to the critics who acknowledge three principal parts of the book, but he takes no definite position on the problem.

of Bar. 1:1-2 for various reasons.[1] In view of these problems the concern of this chapter will be to consider: (1) the question of the unity of authorship, and (2) the question of Baruch's authorship of each or any portion of the book in order to shed light on the literary background of the wisdom passage (Bar. 3:9-4:4).

THE QUESTION OF THE UNITY OF AUTHORSHIP

The question of the unity of authorship will be treated under three headings: (1) the relationship between the prose material (1:1-3:8) and the poetic section (3:9-5:9), (2) the question of the unity of the prose material, and (3) the question of the unity of the poetic section.

The Relationship Between Baruch 1:1-3:8 and 3:9-5:9

Evidence supporting a diversity of authorship will be presented on the basis of language and style, differing viewpoints, and difference of subject matter.

Evidence on the basis of language and style. In respect to the first portion of the book (1:1-3:8) a number

---

[1] See below.

of scholars have called attention to a strong Hebraic accent[1] in contrast to the second half (3:9-5:9), which is marked by a

---

[1]Scholarly opinion is divided on the question of the original language of Baruch: J.J. Kneucker believes the entire book existed originally in Hebrew and presents his own reconstruction of this presumed text. R.R. Harwell also defends an original Hebrew text and translates the Greek of Baruch 3:9-5:9 into Hebrew in order to show that such a reconstruction can be made in the form of Hebrew poetry -- three-beat and five-beat measures -- without rendering violence to the sense of the passage. In his estimation, this constitutes a strong argument in favor of an original Hebrew text. The poetry of Bar. 3:5-5:9, he continues, could not have been composed in Greek, since the verses are not based on the metrical form of Greek poetry, namely, the regular succession of long and short syllables (op. cit., pp. 10-46, 55-56). In addition to Kneucker and Harwell there are a number of scholars who acknowledge an original Hebrew text for the book of Baruch, but few offer sufficient evidence in defence of their position: E. König, Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen Alten Testaments (Bonn: Edward Weber's Verlag, 1893), p. 485; R.H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (New York: Henry Holt and Co., n.d.), pp. 216-217; C.C. Torrey, op. cit., pp. 62-63; W.O.E. Oesterley, An Introduction, p. 266; E. Kalt, op. cit., p. 62; A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (fifth edition; Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publisher, 1959), I, 232; S. Tedesche, "Book of Baruch", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by G.A. Buttrick et al. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 362; R.H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 416-417, 419-423 (Pfeiffer makes a better case for 1:1-3:8 than for 3:9-5:9); and O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 593. This list is by no means exhaustive, but is intended only to indicate the tendency among Biblical critics to think in terms of a Hebrew original.

There are a number of scholars, however, who recognize only 1:1-3:8 as originally existing in Hebrew: O.F. Fritzsche, op. cit., pp. 171-172; E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1924), div. II, vol. III, pp. 190-191; H.L. Strack, op. cit., p. 155; M.R. James, "Apocrypha", Encyclopaedia Biblica, edited by T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899), I, 252; H.St.J. Thackeray op. cit., pp. 86-87; and R. Mayer, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (München: Mas Hueber Verlag, 1967), p. 239.

There are a few scholars who differ somewhat from the two basic positions cited above: J.T. Marshall argues for three different languages, namely, Hebrew for 1:1-3:8, Aramaic for 3:9-4:4, and Greek for 4:5-5:9 (op. cit., pp. 252-253).

more elegant style. This contrast has been observed by critics who have argued for a Greek original, and by proponents of a Hebrew original, as well as by those who have taken a position acknowledging two languages, namely, Hebrew for 1:1-3:8 and Greek for 3:9-5:9.[1] Our concern is not to treat the question of the original language but to show the evidence supporting a diversity of authorship. The two questions, however, are not entirely unrelated, since we will be dealing with the same evidence. The Hebraic character of Bar. 1:1-3:8 can be seen in the following examples: (1) In Bar. 1:10 two expressions have been identified as Hebraisms.[2] The passage reads literally, "and buy with the money burnt offerings and concerning sin [meaning a sin-offering]... and make manna [meaning prepare an offering]". The first expression appears

---

O.C. Whitehouse believes that Bar. 1:4-4:4 was written in Hebrew but 4:5-5:9 was originally in Greek (op. cit., pp. 571-572). According to B.N. Wambacq the introductory verses (1:3-14), as well as the concluding section (4:5-5:9) of the book, would be written in Greek while the material in 1:15-4:4 would be written in Hebrew, although the evidence for 3:9-4:4 is not as strong as that in 1:15-3:8 ("L'unite Litteraire de 1:1-3:8", Sacra Pagina Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XII [1959], 455-460). A few critics, namely, E.J. Goodspeed (op. cit., p. 100), and C.F. Keil (op. cit., pp. 753-754), et al. argue for a Greek original for the entire book.

[1]For example, see Keil (op. cit., p. 751), who attempts to defend an original Greek text, Harwell (op. cit., pp. 63-64), who argues for an original Hebrew text, and E. Schurer (A History of the Jewish People, P. 190), who believes 1:1-3:8 was composed originally in Hebrew, while 3:9-5:9 was written in Greek. The statement of Schurer may be considered representative of the views of the other two: "The style and mode of expression widely differ, being in the first half Hebraistic, and in the second half fluent and rhetorical Greek."

[2]Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 416.

in the Greek as περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Elsewhere in the Septuagint this expression is a rendering of the Hebrew word חַטָּאת.[1] The Hebrew term can mean sin, as well as sin offering, but the Greek term ἁμαρτία does not have this two-fold meaning.[2] The second example appears as μανναα and is actually a transliteration of the Hebrew term מִנְחָה, which has the meaning "cereal offering".[3] The phrase ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη (literally "as this day") has also been recognized as an awkward rendering of a Hebrew idiom meaning "today".[4] The example under consideration occurs in the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew phrase כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה.[5] In Baruch it occurs only in the first portion of the book.[6]

(2) In respect to grammar and syntax we note several examples which have a pronounced Hebrew flavor. The pleonastic pronoun or adverb following a relative pronoun or adverb

---

[1]See, for example, Lev. 7:37.

[2]See Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs (eds.), A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962), pp. 308-309; and Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959), pp. 42-43. Hereafter the references given above will be cited as BDB, and A Greek-English Lexicon, respectively.

[3]BDB, p. 585. Cf. Jer. 17:26; 41:5 (LXX 48:5).

[4]Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 416.

[5]I Sam. 22:8; II Sam. 4:8; I Kgs. 3:16; 8:24,61; I Chron. 6:15; Ezra 9:7,15; Neh. 9:10.

[6]See Bar. 1:15; 2:6,11,26.

forms a construction characteristic in Hebrew.[1] Examples of this construction may be seen in the following passages: οὗ διέσπειρεν αὐτοὺς κύριος ἐκεῖ "where the Lord scattered them there" (literally; 2:4). Similarly, we find the phrase occuring elsewhere in 2:13, οὗ διέσπειρας ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖ "where you have scattered us there", and in 2:29, οὗ διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ "where I will scatter them there"; in 3:8 a phrase identical to that in 2:13 occurs. An example closely corresponding to the construction in Baruch may be found in the Septuagint text of Jeremiah. In Jer. 8:3 we read, οὗ ἐὰν ἐξώσω αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ . The latter is a translation of the Hebrew expression אֲשֶׁר הִדַּחְתִּים שָׁם.[2] Another example of the Hebrew construction in Baruch is the phrase ὧν ἐλήφθη τὸ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τῶν σπλάγχνων αὐτῶν , "of whom have been taken their spirits from their inward parts", i.e., "whose spirits have been taken from their inward parts" (2:17). Again in 2:26 we read, τὸν οἶκον, οὗ ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῷ, "the house, which is called by your name upon it", i.e., "the house which bears your name". A similar phrase occurs in Jer. 7:10, τῷ οἴκῳ, οὗ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτῷ. The phrase in Jeremiah is a translation of the Hebrew expression הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא-שְׁמִי עָלָיו.

(3) Other awkward expressions which betray a Hebraic

---

[1]It is not unheard of in koine Greek. Nevertheless, the frequent occurrence of this construction may be seen as the result of Semitic influence. See H.St.J. Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909), p. 46.

[2]Cf. also Jer. 16:15; 23:2,8; and 24:9

[3]Cf. also Jer. 7:11; 39:34 (MT 32:34);41:15(MT 34:15).

character are καὶ ἀποστρέψουσιν ἀπὸ νώτου αὐτῶν τοῦ σκληροῦ "and they will turn away from their hard back" (2:33), i.e., "from their stubbornness"; and ὅτι λαὸς σκληροτράχηλός ἐστι "for they are a stiff-necked people", i.e., "they are a stubborn people" (2:30).[1]

(4) We find also several difficult readings which can be explained as the result of a mistranslation of the Hebrew. In Bar. 1:22; 2:21,22 and 24 the verb ἐργάζεσθαι occurs with the meaning "to serve", where one would expect the verb δουλεύειν. In the second half of Jeremiah we also find the verb ἐργάζεσθαι used in this sense, which in turn is a translation of the Hebrew word עבד[2] Another example of a difficult reading may be seen in Bar. 2:25. The text reads, "and they perished in great distress, by famine, and sword and a sending". In the book of Jeremiah the phrase "by famine, and sword and

---

[1] Cf. Jer. 3:17; 7:24,26; 11:8; 19:15.

[2] Cf. Jer. 34:6,9,11 (MT 27:6,9,11). In the Septuagint text of Jer. 34:6 both δουλεύειν and ἐργάζεσθαι are found; the latter is a translation of עבד; but there is no corresponding verb for δουλεύειν in the Masoretic text. It is of interest to note that the verb עבד in Aramaic means "to do" or "to make", and, in this respect, shares some meaning with the verb ἐργάζεσθαι (cf. Franz Rosenthal, A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic [second revised printing; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963], p.91). At the time of the translator of the second half of Jeremiah the Hebrew and the Aramaic meanings of עבד may have been intermixed. A similarity has been observed by H.St.J. Thackeray between Bar. 1:1-3:8 and the second half of the book of Jeremiah (see "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", JTS IV [1902], 245-266 and 578-585). But it is not certain whether this similarity is due to the fact that the two works were translated by the same individual or that Bar. 1:1-3:8 is only a close imitation of the style of the second translator of Jeremiah (see Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, p. 87.

pestilence" occurs frequently. It may be that the Greek word ἀποστολή "a sending" is a mistranslation of the Hebrew term דֶּבֶר "a pestilence". In Jer. 39:36 (MT 32:36) such a mistranslation does occur. Finally, we note in Bar. 3:4 the phrase "hear the prayer of the dead of Israel", which has given rise to some theological discussion.[1] The problem has to do with the Greek term τεθνηκότων, which has been explained ingeniously as a mistranslation or a misreading of the Hebrew מְתֵי "men of", as מֵתֵי "dead of".[2]

When we turn to the second portion of the book of Baruch (3:9-5:9) we find a marked difference in style. The evidence of Hebraic influence is not as clear as it was in the first section. The following examples are offered by Pfeiffer as evidence of Hebrew flavor: προσελογίσθης μετὰ τῶν εἰς ᾅδου "you are counted with those in the underworld" (3:11); μακροβίωσις "length of life"[3] (3:14); οὐκ ἔστι τέλος τῆς κτήσεως αὐτῶν "there is no end to their possessions" (3:17); οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξεύρεσις τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν "there is no searching of their labors" (3:18), etc. Pfeiffer cites these examples in an effort to prove a Hebrew original for the second half of the book, as

---

[1]The tendency today among Catholic exegetes, as well as Protestants, is to interpret this expression either as a mistranslation of the Hebrew or as an exaggeration of the miserable condition of the exiles (Cf. A. Penna, op. cit., p. 921). See below as well.

[2]Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 417. This suggestion, however, was made earlier by Harwell, op. cit., p. 54, and may have also been recognized by other scholars before him.

[3]The term is quite rare, occuring in no other place in the Septuagint. See Chapter VI.

well as the first. But the evidence does not seem conclusive. An interesting example of a possible misreading of the Hebrew is found in Bar. 3:23, where reference is made to the "merchants of Merran". It has not been determined, as of yet, that such a place ever existed. A plausible explanation[1] of the origin of this word is that it resulted from a confusion of two Hebrew radicals, namely Daleth and Resh. The corrected text then would read the "merchants of Midian". According to Gen. 37:28,36 the Midianites were merchants along with the Ishmaelites; hence the suggestion is a reasonable one.

The contrast in language and style between Bar. 1:1-3:8 and 3:9-5:9 can be seen more clearly perhaps by a comparison of two passages which are similar in thought and in wording, namely, Bar. 1:18 and 4:12-13. Both passages are intended to provide an explanation for the exile and misfortune of Israel. The passage in the prose section of the book reads as follows: καὶ ἠπειθήσαμεν αὐτῷ καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν πορεύεσθαι τοῖς προστάγμασι κυρίου, οἷς ἔδωκε κατὰ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν. "... and we disobeyed him, and did not listen to the voice of Yahweh our God to walk in the precepts of Yahweh, which he set before us" (literally, "which he gave according to our face"; 1:18). The following passage occurs in the poetic section:

...διότι ἐξέκλιναν ἐκ νόμου θεοῦ
καὶ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν
οὐδὲ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδοῖς ἐντολῶν θεοῦ

[1]Cf. Harwell, op. cit., p. 54.

οὐδὲ τρίβους παιδείας ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ ἐπέβησαν.

...because they turned away from the law of God,
and his statutes they did not acknowledge;
They did not walk in the ways of God's commandments,
nor did they tread the disciplined paths of his
righteousness (4:12b-13).

The evidence presented above shows that the language and style of the material in Bar. 1:1-3:8, in contrast to that of 3:9-5:9, has a strong Hebraic accent. The marked difference between the two sections can be accounted for best, it would seem, by acknowledging a diversity of authorship.

Differing viewpoints. In a general way the historical setting depicted throughout the various parts of the book remains the same: the nation Israel has suffered defeat at the hands of the enemy, and the inhabitants have been taken off into exile.[1] There is general recognition throughout the book that Israel's misfortune came about as a result of her disobedience. The disobedience is generally described in a similar way: Israel refused to walk in the way of God's commandments.[2] Yet, aside from these points in common, one is able to see differing viewpoints and attitudes. For the moment we will concern ourselves with the differences which set the first section (1:1-3:8) apart from the second half (3:9-5:9).

---

[1]Cf. 1:1-2,9-13; 2:4,13,14,27ff.; 3:7,8,10; 4:6,10ff., 15-16,18,24,25,26.

[2]Cf. 1:13,17-20; 2:5,12; 3:4,8,12; 4:6-8,13-14,28.

First we note a difference in the attitude toward the exile. In the introductory verses (1:1-14) one receives the following picture: The exiles are in Babylon by the river Sud.[1] In response to a reading by Baruch the people wept, fasted, prayed, collected money, and sent the money to Jerusalem to be used for the purchase of sacrifices, with the request that prayer be offered on behalf of the ruling powers and the exiles. Coupled with this favorable attitude toward the ruler and his son is a resignation to the idea that the exiles will live in captivity for quite some time (1:3-7,10-13). It is clear that these verses are intended to serve as a response to Jeremiah's letter to the exiles in Babylon. The letter was sent to the exiles by the hand of Elasah and Gemariah, and presumably was also read by them (Jer. 29:1-3). In the letter Jeremiah advises the exiles to prepare for a long stay in Babylon by building houses, planting gardens, getting married, and having children; for there will be no return in the near future. Moreover, the exiles are to seek the welfare of the city of Babylon and offer prayer on its behalf (29:4-9).

---

[1]Cf. J.A. Bewer, "The River Sud in the Book of Baruch", JBL XLIII (1924), 226-227. As yet the river Sud has not been located. According to Bewer the term Sud resulted from a scribal error. The author of Bar. 1:4, he believes, was dependent on Ezra 8:15 ff. for the scene depicted in the introductory verses. In the book of Ezra the exiles appear beside the river Ahawa (or Ahava), fasting and praying to God. In the Hebrew the term Ahawa appears as אַהֲוָא . This term, according to Bewer, was transliterated into Greek by the author of Bar. 1:4 in one of three forms: AOYA or EOYE or EOYA. These uncials were misread later by a copyist as COYD, and thus the error was transmitted in the text.

The introductory section then, points to a time at the beginning of the exile, and also reflects a favorable attitude toward the enemy. In contrast to the picture set forth in these verses the material in the concluding portion of the book has only bitter words for the enemy:

> Fearful will be those who ill-treated you
> and rejoiced at your fall.
> Fearful will be the cities which enslaved your children,
> fearful will be the one which received your sons.
> For as she rejoiced at your fall,
> and was glad at your ruin,
> so she will be grieved at her own desolation (4:31-33).

Moreover, the author, in contrast to the introductory section, writes in imminent expectation of the return of the exiles: Jerusalem is assured that God has not forgotten her children but is leading them home in unsurpassed splendor.[1]

Further evidence of diversity can be seen also in the predominating mood of the different sections of the book. In the first portion of the book we note petitions for mercy and deliverance interspersed with lamentations depicting the miserable lot of the sufferers: they are greatly distressed, bent over, and feeble (2:16-17). In utter anguish and weariness of spirit they call for help (3:1). In fact the confessions and prayers end on a note of hopelessness: the exiles have turned from the sins of their fathers, have called upon the name of Yahweh, and have offered him praise, but they are still in captivity. In sharp contrast to the mood of these verses is

---

[1]Cf. 5:1-9. The message of assurance in 5:1-9 is directed to Jerusalem and cannot be understood originally to have had in mind the laments and complaints of the exiles in 1:15-3:8.

the tone of the concluding verse of the wisdom passage:

> Happy are we, O Israel,
> for what is pleasing to God is known to us.

Different subject matter. A brief sketch of the contents of the book will disclose a diversity of subject matter. The introductory verses (1:1-14) contain specific references to the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem and the exile of the city's inhabitants (1:1-2). We have already noted some correspondence between this portion of the book of Baruch and Jeremiah 29. The picture of Baruch reading before the exiles -- in particular Jeconiah, the king of Judah -- calls to mind an earlier event, when Baruch read before Jeconiah's father, Jehoiakim. The latter treated the message of Jeremiah with utter scorn (Jer. 36:20-27). The author may have intended to contrast the humble position of Jeconiah in exile with the arrogant, and self-confident spirit of Jehoiakim. The introductory verses of Baruch may be seen then, to serve several interests: (1) to provide a historical setting for the book, (2) to convey a spirit of good will toward the ruling powers, and (3) to provide an introduction for the confessions and prayers which immediately follow. The last concern may be seen in verse 14: "And you shall read this book which we are sending you, to make confession in the house of the Lord on feast days and at appointed seasons". The liturgical interest in the introductory passage is evident in a number of verses: (a) the reference to Baruch's reading before the exiles (vs. 3), (b) the weeping, fasting and praying of the people, as

well as their collecting money for the Jerusalem community (vss. 5-6), (c) an interest in the return of the vessels which belonged to the temple in Jerusalem (vs. 8), (d) the concern for sacrifice and prayer (vss. 10-13), and (e) the request to read the book at liturgical gatherings (vs. 14).

The confessions and prayers which follow verse 14 contain very little material not found elsewhere in the Old Testament.[1] It is not our concern to analyze the material in terms of sources, etc., but to indicate its dominant interests. Throughout Bar. 1:15-3:8 there is the recognition that Israel alone is responsible for the misfortune that has come about;[2] the misfortune is not so much the destruction of the city or the temple as it is the shame and reproach accompanying the exile.[3] Primary interest seems to be centered on the return to the homeland.

Without any transition or introduction a new theme

---

[1] See Chapter II of the dissertation.

[2] Cf. Pfeiffer's statement: "The sin of Israel is not specified exactly, as in the writings of the ancient prophets; we almost gain the impression that the sinfulness of the people was deduced from the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, but that the author had no accurate and detailed information about it." This notion of sin, Pfeiffer states, is conceived as "rebellion against God", a general conception which becomes more common in the years following the Maccabean struggles (op. cit., p. 424).

[3] With the exception of 2:26 there is no reference in the book of Baruch to the destruction of the temple. In 2:23 reference is made to the desolation of the land of Israel, but this is too general a statement for one to infer that the author is alluding to the destruction of the temple. Both verses (2:23, and 2:26) are based on Jer. 7:34, and 7:14 respectively. On the other hand, we note a number of statements depicting the shame and reproach of the exiles (cf. 1:15; 2:4,5,6; 3:8).

appears in 3:9. The primary concern is no longer with the exile but centers around the pursuit of wisdom. The author is concerned with several questions, namely, the accessibility of wisdom, wisdom and creation, and wisdom and the Torah. Wisdom is the exclusive property of the God who created the heavens and the earth (3:32). But the Creator gave wisdom to his people Israel (3:36-37). This wisdom is none other than the Torah (4:1). Job, Proverbs, Sirach, Deuteronomy and Deutero-Isaiah form the background of the material in Bar. 3:9-4:4.[1]

Following the passage on wisdom we note a number of poems which treat the themes of the desolation and restoration of Jerusalem, and which share material in common with Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah, and the Psalms of Solomon.[2] Of special interest is the way Jerusalem is conceived. Here she is portrayed as the innocent sufferer: She was grieved by those whom she reared (4:9); her desolation was caused by the sins of her children (4:12); she is unable to deliver them from the hand of the enemy (4:17) but intercedes on their behalf (4:20), and is assured that God will bring deliverence (4:22). The picture of Jerusalem which emerges in 4:5-5:9, then, is unique to the passage.[3]

---

[1] See Chapters IV, V, and VI of the dissertation.

[2] See Chapter II.

[3] Cf. Lam. 1:8-9,14,17-18,20,22,etc. Jerusalem in the book of Lamentations, is responsible for her own desolation, as well as the suffering of her children.

In addition to the different themes in the book, there are a number of different titles of the deity. References to the deity appear ninety-two times in the book -- eight in the introductory verses (1:1-14), forty-two in the confessions and prayers (1:15-3:8), six in the poem on wisdom (3:9-4:4) and, thirty-six in the poems concerning Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). In the first half of the book (1:1-3:8) the title κύριος appears, oftentimes by itself,[1] but many times with other designations such as θεὸς ,[2] θεὸς Ισραηλ,[3] and παντοκράτωρ ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ.[4] The designation κύριος does not appear at all in the second half of the book (3:9-5:9). Instead we find only θεὸς used in 3:9-4:4,[5] and in 4:5-5:9,[6] with some additional designations peculiar to the latter. In 4:5-5:9 the title ὁ αἰώνιος appears several times by itself[7] and twice with θεὸς .[8] Σωτῆρ and ὁ ἅγιος are also titles for the deity which are peculiar to 4:5-5:9.[9]

On the basis of the evidence presented above there is reason to believe that the material in the first half of the book (1:1-3:8) and that of the second half (3:9-5:9) did not come from the same individual, but originally emanated from

---

[1] 1:5,8,12,13,14,17,18,19,20,etc.

[2] 1:10,13,15,18,19,21; 2:5,6,etc.

[3] 2:11.

[4] 3:1,4.

[5] 3:13,24,27,35; 4:1,4.

[6] 4:6,7,9,12,13,21,23,24,25,27,28,36,37,etc.

[7] 4:10,14,24,35.

[8] 4:8,27.

[9] 4:22,37; 5:5.

different hands. We turn next to consider the question of the unity of the first half of the book.

The Unity of the Prose Material (1:1-3:8)

The introductory verses (1:3-14). Several scholars -- F. Hitzig,[1] J.J. Kneucker,[2] C.H. Toy,[3] O. Eissfeldt,[4] A. Weiser,[5] B.N. Wambacq,[6] and others -- do not regard the prose material as the work of a single author, but consider 1:3-14 as a later interpolation. Wambacq distinguishes between the Greek of 1:15-3:8 and that of 1:3-14, believing that the former is the result of a translation of a Hebrew original, while the latter was written in Greek.[7] Whether or not Wambacq has proven this remains to be seen. In any event the burden of proof would lie with the one who would postulate a Hebrew original for the introductory verses, since the evidence of Hebraic influence is predominate in 1:15-3:8. The awkward ren-

---

[1]This information was taken from E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People, div. II, vol. III, p. 190.

[2]Op. cit., pp. 13-18.

[3]"Book of Baruch", The Jewish Encyclopedia, edited by Isidore Singer, et al. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1902), II, 556.

[4]Op. cit., p. 594.

[5]Einleitung in das Alte Testament (second edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), p. 294.

[6]"L'unité du livre de Baruch", pp. 574-576.

[7]"L'unité littéraire de Baruch 1:1-3:8", pp. 455-460.

derings in 1:10 can be considered as evidence of an influence of the Septuagint text on the writer rather than an indication of a Hebrew original.

The passage 1:3-14, moreover, has the appearance of an interpolation which interrupts the sequence of thought. Verses 3-14 consist of a narrative which tells of the reading of the book of Baruch and the effect that this had upon the hearers. But these verses separate 1:15 from 1:2. Upon reading 1:1-2 one does not expect the narrative which follows but the confession which begins in verse 15: "And these are the words of the scroll, which Baruch wrote...in Babylon...at the time when the Chaldeans took Jerusalem and burned it with fire.... 'To the Lord our God belongs righteousness, but to us shame, as this day'". Verses 15 ff., then, may be seen to form a natural sequel to verse 2. The connection which was broken by the insertion of verses 3-14 has been restored by the first part of verse 15: "And you will say...."

Some have argued that the passage 1:3-14 presupposes a different situation from that in 1:2 and 1:15-3:8.[1] The latter presuppose the period after 587 B.C. when the temple was destroyed, while the former points to the time after Jehoiachin's departure (598 B.C.) but before 587 B.C., when the temple was still standing and the sacrificial cultus was in operation. The suggestion seems plausible, although the evidence is not conclusive.[2] It would seem less probable,

---

[1] See Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 594.

[2] It cannot be proven from the statements in 1:15-3:8

however, that 1:3-14 originally belonged to the confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8.

The concluding prayer (3:1-8). The final section of the prose material (3:1-8) has been regarded as an independent prayer.[1] The preceding verses (2:34-35) can be seen as a natural and more suitable ending to the prayer. In these verses Yahweh is the speaker: "And I will bring them back to the land which I promised by oath to their fathers... and I will establish an everlasting covenant with them...and I will never again remove my people Israel from the land which I gave them." Immediately following these verses is an invocation containing an address to the deity which is peculiar to the final section: "Lord Almighty, God of Israel" (3:1,4). Moreover, in contrast to the confessions and prayer in 1:15-2:35 the petitioners in 3:1-8 do not identify themselves with the transgressors but belong to another generation:[2] "Hear the prayer...of the

---

that the author is writing at a time when the city and the temple lay in ruins. It is important to keep in mind a distinction, on the one hand, between the situation assumed by the author, and, on the other hand, the actual situation existing at the time of his composition.

[1]L. Bertholdt attributes 1:15-2:35 and 3:1-8 to two different authors (cf. E.C. Bissell, The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with Historical Introductions, A Revised Translation, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. [New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1903], p. 413).

[2]One exception is found in 3:2. One wonders, however, whether this verse originally formed a part of this prayer. In view of the invocation repeated in verse 4 it is possible to consider the first three verses a later addition designed to connect the material in the second prayer with that in the first. On the other hand, it is not necessary to consider every repetition, especially in a prayer of this type, as

sons of those who sinned against you; they did not obey...and the misfortune has clung to us" (3:4); "Remember not the misdeeds of our fathers" (3:5); "Behold, we are today in our captivity, where you have scattered us...because of all the misdeeds of our fathers who departed from the Lord our God" (3:8). At the same time, it is no longer possible to distinguish between the author of 3:1-8 and the redactor of 1:15-2:35, for the material in the former presupposes the statements made in the latter.[1] Furthermore, since the material in 1:15-3:8

---

evidence of further composition.

[1]We note the following correspondence between the statements in 3:1-8 and the prayer in 2:11-35: (1) The mood and condition of the exiles is described in similar language; it is one of anguish and weariness of spirit; they are at the point of death. (2) In 3:5 an appeal is made that God will remember his power and his name in the present crisis. The power and name of God are seen in 2:11 in connection with his redemptive activity on behalf of Israel. Here we note an allusion to the Exodus tradition. Reference is made to the signs, wonders, and great power which accompanied the deliverance (cf. Deut. 26:8); this was the time when Yahweh made a name for himself. (3) Moreover, in 2:14-15 an appeal is made that Yahweh act on behalf of Israel that all nations may know that Yahweh is the God of Israel, for Israel has been called after his name (cf. 3:6). (4) In the closing verses of chapter 2 the thought is advanced that Israel in the land of their exile will turn away from the iniquity of those who sinned before them; they will praise Yahweh and remember his name. This conversion will be followed by a return to the promised land (vss. 30-35). The statements in 3:6-7 may be seen as a fulfilment of 2:30-33: The exiles have turned from the sins of their fathers; they call on the name of Yahweh and praise him in the land of their exile. (5) But the return home has not as yet taken place; the statement in Bar. 3:8 then, can be fully appreciated only in the light of the promise given in 2:34-35: Israel has turned to Yahweh and worships him as their God, but they are still in exile! The one who was responsible for the material in the second prayer, then, must have had the first prayer (1:15-2:35) before him. This would account for the close relationship between the thought of the second prayer and that of the concluding lines of the first prayer.

consists of a number of quotations from and allusions to Old Testament passages,[1] a lack of consistency need not be interpreted as evidence of diverse authorship, but rather, the result of the writer's use of different source material. In either case it would be more appropriate to use the term author-redactor when referring to the one responsible for the present form of the material in 1:15-3:8. It is quite possible that 1:15-3:8 was edited by a single hand, but as to the original form of the individual units one can be less certain.

The Unity of the Poetic Section (3:9-5:9)

The passage on wisdom and the poems about Jerusalem. Scholarly opinion is divided on the question of the unity of the poetic material. The tendency today is to regard the two poems as the work of different authors.[2] Evidence in support of this position has been advanced primarily on the basis of the different subject matter treated in the poems: the material in 3:9-4:4 has its roots in the wisdom-teaching whereas the author of 4:5-5:9 works within the framework of the Jerusalem traditions. Moreover, each passage begins with an introduction which takes the reader in a different direction: the former

---

[1] See Chapter II.

[2] See above where reference is made to the various positions taken by scholars on the question of the unity of authorship. Cf. also L.A. Iranyi, "Book of Baruch", New Catholic Encyclopedia, edited by William J. McDonald et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), II, 139.

exhorts the nation to hear wisdom and adhere to the Torah whereas the latter is a message of comfort and hope. While it is not impossible, it, nevertheless, seems unlikely that the two poems would come from the same individual.

The unity of the wisdom passage (3:9-4:4). Something must be said about the unity of the individual units. According to Wambacq's[1] judgment the passage 3:10-13 did not belong to the original poem on wisdom, but was added by a redactor in an attempt to adapt the material to the setting depicted in 4:5-5:9, as well as throughout the first part of the book, namely, the setting of the exile. Wambacq identifies the author of 1:3-14 with the editor of 3:9-4:4 and 4:5-5:9. But this is not possible to determine with certainty. There seems to be some grounds, however, for considering verses 10-13 as a later addition. Aside from these verses there is no reference elsewhere in the passage to Israel in exile. Verses 10-13 attempt to explain Israel's misfortune as the result of her forsaking wisdom; the appeal is for Israel to return to "the way of God". But this is not the same situation that is presupposed in the concluding verses: Israel has not forsaken the Torah, but is on the verge of doing so; she is not fully convinced of her priceless possession. Hence, she is confronted with an appeal to turn and embrace the truth entrusted to her and not to give

---

[1] "L'unité du livre de Baruch", pp. 574 f.; this conclusion would be reached earlier by L.E. Tony André (Les Apocryphes de L'Ancien Testament [Florence: Osvald Paggi, 1903], pp. 260 f.), and O.C. Whitehouse (op. cit., p. 570).

her privileges to an alien race (4:2-3). Moreover, the expressions "the fountain of wisdom" and "the way of God", as well as the reference to the land of the enemy as a place of defilement, are all peculiar to verses 10-13.[1] It is difficult furthermore to conceive that the same author would speak, on the one hand, of Israel as a people growing old in exile (vs. 10), defiled with the dead (vs. 10), and counted with the inhabitants of the underworld (vs. 11), and then, on the other hand, conclude with the words:

> Happy are we, O Israel,
> for what is pleasing to God is known to us.

It would seem more probable, therefore, that the original material consisted of 3:9,14-4:4.

The unity of the poems about Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). The question of the unity of 4:5-5:9 is much more complicated than that of the wisdom passage. The poems in 4:5-5:9 consist of a number of small units, but for the sake of our discussion can be divided into three parts: 4:5-9a; 4:9b-29; 4:30-5:9.[2] At

---

[1] See below in Chapter VI.

[2] W. Rothstein would see 4:9b-29 and 4:30-5:9 as existing independently originally; the introductory verses (4:5-9a) would be added at a later date, presumably when the two "songs" were brought together. Cf. Das Buch Baruch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, edited by E. Kautzsch (Tübingen: Verlag von T.C.B. Mohr, 1921), I, 214. O. Eissfeldt describes 4:5-5:9 as a "chain of poems built up into a larger unit", which "contains songs of consolation at the beginning and end, in which the poet, or even God himself, speaks encouragingly to Israel -- Jerusalem (4:5-9a; 4:30-35; 4:36-5:4; 5:5-9), and in the middle are songs of lamentations in which Jerusalem herself speaks and expresses her distress (4:9b-16; 4:17-29)." But Eissfeldt does not say whether we are to attribute these poems to one or several authors (op. cit., p. 593).

first glance these poems appear to come from a single poet: (1) A number of units are introduced with an address which reflects a stylistic feature: θαρσεῖτε, λαός μου (4:5), θαρσεῖτε, τέκνα (4:21), θαρσήσατε, τέκνα (4:27), θάρσει, Ιερουσαλημ (4:30). (2) A certain unity may also be seen throughout the content of these poems: there is general agreement in 4:23 and 5:6, for example, that the departure of the exiles in sorrow and shame will be superceded by a joyful and glorious return. The passages 4:24 and 5:4 each contain the promise that Israel's splendor will be witnessed by the surrounding nations. We note also in 4:25 and 4:31-35 the concern for vengeance upon Israel's enemies. (3) Finally, in 5:1-2 we note words of assurance cast in language similar to that in 4:20:

Baruch 4:20	Baruch 5:1-2
ἐξεδυσάμην τὴν στολὴν τῆς εἰρήνης, ἐνεδυσάμην δὲ σάκκον....	ἔκδυσαι... τὴν στολὴν τοῦ πένθους... ἔνδυσαι τὴν εὐπρέπειαν....

One, however, cannot defend the unity of 4:5-5:9 without encountering some difficulties. The material in 4:9b-29 shows signs of being an independent, self-contained unit: (1) The unit of 4:9b-29 begins with an address to the neighboring cities: Ἀκούσατε, αἱ πάροικοι Σιων. The content of the preceding material (4:5-9a) consists of an introductory message but the speaker is not the same as the one in 4:9b-29. In the former the speaker is an anonymous poet who utters words of comfort to the exiles; in the latter the speaker is Jerusalem, personified as the mother of the exiles. Her message consists

of two parts: (a) 4:9b-16, a speech containing a series of laments, uttered to the neighboring cities and, (b) 4:17-29 a message directed to the captives, consisting of lamentations (vss. 17-20) and words of consolation (vss. 21-29). The first part of verse 9 provides the connecting link between the poet's words to the exiles and Jerusalem's speech to the neighboring cities: "She indeed saw the anger of God coming upon you and she said...." With these words the poet attempts to incorporate Jerusalem's message into his own. But he fails to do this in a satisfactory way. For example, the introductory verses refer to Jerusalem's distress and, in this respect, are fitting for the sorrowful message immediately following; but they do not provide a suitable introduction for the words of consolation addressed later to the exiles (4:21-29). Moreover, the material ends with Jerusalem speaking to the exiles, so that the poet has nothing further to say to them than what was said in 4:5-9a. The introductory material in 4:5-9a, in this respect, gives the impression of being an addition attached to the speeches of Jerusalem at a later date. While the evidence for this is not conclusive, one is tempted to consider 4:5-9a as secondary, in view of what has been said above.

(2) Further evidence in favor of 4:9b-29 as an independent unit can be seen in the message of hope directed to the exiles. Jerusalem's speech ends with a note of hope, assuring the exiles that God has not forsaken them, but will bring them back to their homeland (4:27-29). These words of assurance provide an appropriate ending to the speech, and tend to make

the consoling message in 4:30-5:9 anticlimatic. The latter would be more fitting after 4:16 or 4:20.

(3) Finally, we note the repetition of certain phrases throughout 4:9b-29 which seem to be a characteristic feature of the style of the writer:

4:10 ἣν ἐπήγαγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ αἰώνιος
4:14 ἣν ἐπήγαγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ αἰώνιος

4:11 ἐξαπέστειλα δὲ μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ πένθους
4:23 ἐξέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς μετὰ πένθους καὶ κλαυθμοῦ

4:21 θαρσεῖτε, τέκνα, βοήσατε πρὸς τὸν θεόν
4:27 θαρσήσατε, τέκνα, καὶ βοήσατε πρὸς τὸν θεόν

A word must be said about the correspondence in thought between Jerusalem's words to the exiles (4:21-29) and the poet's announcement of salvation to Jerusalem (4:30-5:9). We have already had occasion to note some common ground between the two speeches in respect to the description of the exile and return of Jerusalem's children, and the pending doom pronounced on her enemies. A closer study of the two speeches will show that the poet's message to Jerusalem seems to elaborate and,perhaps one may say, develop further Jerusalem's speech to the exiles: (1) In 4:23 it is stated that the exiles will return in joy and gladness. The same thought is expressed -- but in much more elaborate language -- in 4:36-37 and 5:5. (2) In 4:24 Jerusalem assures the exiles that the splendor of their return will be seen by the neighboring cities which witnessed their shameful departure whereas in 5:1-4 Jerusalem is told that God will show her splendor "everywhere under heaven". The announcement of salvation, moreover, is depicted in

language associated with messianic themes.[1] (3) In 4:25 Jerusalem admonishes her children to have patience for God is about to pour out his wrath on the enemy. The theme of God's judgment upon the enemies of Jerusalem is treated by the poet in 4:31-35. The city that rejoiced over the fall of Jerusalem will now grieve over her own ruin. Fire will soon consume that city and the remains will become the habitation of demons. (4) Finally, we note in 4:26 a reference to the rough roads the exiles were forced to travel on when they were led away as captives. An interesting contrast to this event appears in 5:6-9 where the poet, in language drawn from Deutero-Isaiah,[2] portrays the return of the exiles in glorious terms. They were led away on foot by the enemy but God will bring them back in glory, as one carries a royal throne. At the command of God a change in nature takes place to prepare a way for Israel: the mountains and the hills are leveled, and the gullies are filled with earth to make a smooth road for the exiles. The trees provide shade along the way as God himself leads Israel in the light of his glory. A close correspondence can be seen, then, between 4:21-29 and 4:30-5:9. This can be interpreted as evidence that both passages came from the same hand. Or, one might suggest that the author of 4:30-5:9 was inspired by the material in 4:21-29 and sought to

---

[1]See, for example, the name given to Jerusalem: "Peace of righteousness and glory of godliness"; cf. Isa. 1:26; Jer. 33:16; and Eze. 48:35.

[2]See Chapter II of the dissertation.

elaborate more fully the message of assurance and salvation. I am inclined toward the latter position while realizing, at the same time, that this cannot be proven on the basis of the evidence available.

Conclusions Concerning the Unity of Authorship

The present form of the book of Baruch could not have been written by a single author. Evidence on the basis of language and style, differing viewpoints and different subject matter testify against a unity of authorship. Instead, the composition of the book seems to have developed in various stages. In view of its diversity it would be more appropriate to speak of the book as a compilation of a variety of materials. The questions of the presumed original form of the book and the different stages of its development will be treated later in the study. The conclusions reached thus far are the following: (1) In general the book may be divided into three major parts, namely, 1:1-3:8; 3:9-4:4; and 4:5-5:9. The majority of critics divide the book this way and assign each part to different authors. (2) But each of these major sections did not come from a single author: (a) Recently, Wambacq, among others, has argued that 1:3-14 did not belong originally to 1:15-3:8, but was added at a later date. The evidence offered seems to warrant this conclusion. (b) The confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8 pose a problem. Much of the material

consists of quotations from and allusions to Old Testament passages. This will be more clearly seen in the next chapter. In view of the fact that the material in 1:15-3:8 shows little originality the term author would seem to be less appropriate here than elsewhere in the book. A more suitable expression would be redactor or author-redactor. This would account for the inconsistency in the two prayers. (c) The original form of the poem on wisdom contained no reference to the exile; 3:10-13 can be explained best as an editorial insertion which was made in order to adapt the poem to the general setting of the book. (d) In the poems concerning Jerusalem, it is possible, though not certain, that 4:9b-29 was an independent, self-contained unit. The introductory verses (4:5-9a) then, as well as the material in 4:30-5:9, would be a later addition; but whether this was done by the author of 4:9b-29 or by another hand, we have no way of determining.

In each of the three main divisions (1:1-3:8; 3:9-4:4; 4:5-5:9) then, there seems to be evidence of further composition; but it is not possible to determine how many hands were at work in the composition of the book. That the author of 1:3-14 was also the one responsible for editing the wisdom poem (3:10-13) and the poems concerning Jerusalem (4:5-9a) is doubtful, for the reasons already given above. It is possible, however, that the editor of the poem on wisdom also provided the introductory verses (4:5-9a) for the final section.

THE QUESTION OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF BARUCH

The authenticity of Bar. 1:1-2. Since the book of Baruch could be a composite work, brought together gradually in several stages, attempts would be made to distinguish the original form of the book from its final form. Scholars have postulated various theories of the presumed original text, suggesting, on the one hand, that Bar. 1:1-2 originally belonged to the confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8,[1] and, on the other hand, to the wisdom passage (3:9-4:4).[2] Before considering this question, some attention must be given to the problems posed by these verses (1:1-2).

The opening verses of the book read as follows: Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου, οὓς ἔγραψε βαρουχ ἐν βαβυλῶνι ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ πέμπτῳ ἐν ἑβδόμῃ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ᾧ ἔλαβον οἱ Χαλδαῖοι τὴν Ιερουσαλημ καὶ ἐνέπρησαν αὐτὴν ἐν πυρί. "And these are the words of the scroll, which Baruch wrote... in Babylon in the fifth year, on the seventh of the month, at the time when the Chaldeans took Jerusalem and burned it with fire" (1:1-2). The problems confronting us are of a chronological and historical nature, having to do, on the one hand, with the purported date of the book and, on the other hand, with the factuality of Baruch's presence in Babylon.

The chronological data given in verse 2 are not very

---

[1] Cf. W. Stoderl, op. cit., pp. 5 ff.

[2] Cf. J.J. Kneucker, op. cit., pp. 37-61.

clear. Not only is the name or the number of the month omitted but also the event from which the "fifth year" is dated. The only other reference to a date in the book is found in Bar. 1:8, a verse which offers further difficulties. Evidence was advanced earlier on the basis of which the material in 1:3-14 was considered secondary. The unity of verses 3-14 has also been questioned. Verse 8 reads as follows: ἐν τῷ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν τὰ σκεύη οἴκου κυρίου τὰ ἐξενεχθέντα ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ἀποστρέψαι εἰς γῆν Ιουδα τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ Σιουαν, σκεύη ἀργυρᾶ, ἃ ἐποίησε Σεδεκίας υἱὸς Ιωσία βασιλεὺς Ιουδα. "At that time he took the vessels of the house of the Lord, which had been carried away from the temple, to return them to the land of Judah on the tenth of Sivan -- the silver vessels which Zedekiah the son of Josiah, king of Judah had made." The passage along with verse 9 interrupts the sequence of thought in the narrative. Both verses can be easily removed without disturbing the sense of the preceding and subsequent verses. Upon their removal verse 10 can be seen as a natural sequel to verse 7. For these reasons the passage 1:8-9 has been regarded as a gloss which was inserted into the text at a later date.[1] Whether the passage is a gloss or a digression made by the one responsible for 1:3-14 is not our concern for the moment. Aside from this question, the verse presents other problems. It is not certain, for example, whether the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτός is Joiakim in verse 7 or Baruch in verse 3. The

---

[1] Ibid.

context seems to favor Baruch, since he is in Babylon whereas Joiakim is in Jerusalem. What interests us in this verse is the date the tenth of Sivan -- a date when Baruch supposedly returned the vessels to Jerusalem. From the introductory verses then, the following picture emerges: Baruch reads his message before the exiles in Babylon, receives a favorable response, and returns to Jerusalem on the tenth of Sivan, taking with him the money collected by the exiles and the silver vessels (vss. 5-8), as well as the instructions concerning sacrifice, prayer, etc. (vss. 10-14). The month Sivan is believed to be the third month of the Jewish year, corresponding to May-June of our calendar year.[1] We have no way of determining whether the one responsible for verse 8 was concerned with the problem of identifying the month referred to in verse 2. Such a connection, if intended, seems to contradict the record in II Kgs. 25:8 ff., insofar as the date for the burning of Jerusalem is concerned. We will return to this problem a little later in the study.

In addition to the problem of identifying the month, we are confronted with the ambiguous reference, "the fifth year". Critics are divided in determining what is meant by "the fifth year". Some interpret it as the fifth year of the reign of Zedekiah (or the fifth year of the exile of

---

[1]Cf. Siegfried H. Horn, "Sivan", Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary, edited by Don F. Neufeld et al. ("Commentary Reference Series"; Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960), VIII, 1022.

Jeconiah).[1] Baruch, then, would be in Babylon at the same time as the prophet Ezekiel (593/592 B.C.).[2] Other critics date "the fifth year" from the time of the captivity of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem, according to the Biblical record, was burned (587 B.C.).[3] According to this view Baruch was in Babylon in 582 B.C. But the problem with both of these interpretations is that they fail to take into account the last part of verse two, namely, the words ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ᾧ ἔλαβον οἱ Χαλδαῖοι τὴν Ιερουσαλημ καὶ ἐνέπρησαν αὐτὴν ἐν πυρί "at the time when the Chaldeans took Jerusalem and burned it with fire". This clause seems to indicate that the "fifth year" (the time of Baruch's presence in Babylon) was coincident with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldean armies in 587 B.C. We have no record that Jerusalem was burned in the fifth year of Zedekiah's reign. In II Kings and the book of Jeremiah we find that Jerusalem was besieged by the Chaldean armies on two different occasions; the first occasion was the revolt of Jehoiakim (c. 602 B.C.);[4] the siege took place three years later, after Jeconiah was enthroned. The second occasion was the revolt of

---

[1]Cf. J.J. Kneucker, op. cit., pp. 10-16,413; C.C. Torrey, op. cit., p. 60.

[2]Ezekiel received his first visions while among the exiles in Babylon in "the fifth year of the exile of king Jehoiachin" (Jeconiah; Eze. 1:2).

[3]Cf. O.F. Fritzsche, op. cit., p. 178.

[4]Cf. II Kgs. 24:1-8; cf. also Martin Noth, The History of Israel, translated by R.R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1960), p. 282.

Zedekiah (c. 589 B.C.).[1] It was during the suppression of Zedekiah's revolt that Jerusalem was burned. But this took place not in the fifth year of Zedekiah's reign but in his eleventh year (587 B.C.).[2] Consequently, "the fifth year" cannot be a reference to the reign of Zedekiah. Unsatisfactory also is the view which places Baruch in Babylon in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, since the text in Bar. 1:2 states that Baruch was in Babylon at the time Jerusalem was destroyed. If our interpretation of the last part of verse two is correct, then we have a date from which to work: the problem could be solved by moving the date back five years from 587 B.C. to 592 B.C. But the date 592 B.C. has little significance, insofar as our problem is concerned, unless it represents the time when Baruch supposedly arrived in Babylon. This means that he would have sojourned in Babylon for at least five years; while this is possible, it seems less likely to be so. The chronological data in 1:2, then, are highly ambiguous; we are not able to determine with any degree of certainty whether Baruch is supposed to be in Babylon in 593/592 B.C. (the fifth year of the reign of Zedekiah) or in 587 B.C. (the fifth year of his stay in Babylon) or in 582 B.C. (the fifth year after the captivity of Zedekiah).

It is altogether possible, on the other hand, that the ambiguity of the chronological data is the result of an un-

---

[1]Cf. II Kgs. 24:18-25:12; Jer. 52:3-16; Noth, op. cit., p. 284.

[2]Noth, op. cit., p. 284.

intentional scribal error; this would mean that the original text in accordance with II Kgs. 25:8 ff. would have read "in the fifth month, on the seventh of the month",[1] instead of "in the fifth year, on the seventh of the month". There is no support for this revision in the manuscripts, but the conjecture is not entirely unwarranted in view of the fact that the Jews for some time after the exile would observe a fast in the fifth month in commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans.[2] Such an interpretation, moreover, is in keeping with the liturgical character of the book in general,[3] and, in particular, with the specific reference to fasting in Bar. 1:5 and the instruction in verse 14 to read the words of the book on the days of the feasts, as well as other liturgical gatherings. The fact that verses 3-14 are understood to be secondary would not affect this interpretation of verse 2; instead, it may be seen as additional support, since it would represent a similar way of understanding the chronological data. If we are correct in our exegesis then we are faced with the problem, on the one hand, of reconciling the date in 1:8 with

---

[1]This emendation was suggested earlier by J.J. Kneucker, op. cit., pp. 9,200; and W.O.E. Oesterley, An Introduction, pp. 256 f. H. Ewald changes the words ἐν τῷ καιρῷ to πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ in order for the text to read "in the fifth year before the destruction of Jerusalem" (this information was taken from W. Stoderl, op. cit., pp. 16-17).

[2]Cf. Zech. 7:5; 8:19.

[3]See the concluding remarks in Chapter II where reference is made to the use of the book of Baruch in Jewish liturgical services.

that of verse 2 or, on the other hand, of considering the former as a gloss; I am inclined toward the second possibility.[1] If our interpretation of verse 2 is correct then, Baruch's stay in Babylon would be at the same time as the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. But leaving aside this suggestion for the moment, we will reconsider the possibility of a journey or deportation at an earlier or later date.

It is not clear from Bar. 1:1-2 whether Baruch was sent to Babylon by Jeremiah[2] or deported there by Nebuchadnezzar. W. Erbt,[3] on the assumption that Jeremiah 45 is the prophet's parting oracle to Baruch, suggests that Jeremiah sent Baruch to Babylon to convey a message of hope to

---

[1]Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, p. 93: "I should agree that the date in v. 8 has got out of place, but in view of the evidence of the versions I should banish it altogether from the original text. The '10th Sivan' and the '10th Nisan' are alternative glosses, guesses at the particular occasion which the writer left undefined."

[2]H. Ewald suggests that the introductory verses (1:1-14) are intended to correspond to the visit arranged by Jeremiah (Jer. 29) shortly after the first deportation to Babylon. Jeremiah sent a message to the exiles, advising them to settle down in Babylon and to pray for the welfare of the government. The introductory verses in Baruch (1:1-14) correspond rather closely to Jeremiah's message (29:3); hence it is doubtful that he went to Babylon at that time. This does not rule out the suggestion, however, that the one responsible for verses 3-14 intended to convey the idea that Baruch would be among those sent to Babylon (The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (second edition; London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1880), V, 207.

[3]Jeremia u.s. Zeit., p. 86; taken from John Skinner, Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah (Cambridge: The University Press, 1961), p. 349.

the Jewish exiles. O.F. Fritzsche[1] is open to the possibility of a journey of Baruch to Babylon, and argues that Bar. 1:2 has a chronological error, since Baruch's journey would have taken place shortly after the departure of Jeconiah but before the burning of Jerusalem. This suggestion is plausible, although there is no conclusive evidence that Baruch ever made a journey to Babylon. An interesting theory is that Baruch's alleged presence in Babylon is the result of a confusion of Baruch with his brother Seriah, who was sent to Babylon by Jeremiah during the reign of Zedekiah (593 B.C.).[2]

According to the historical appendix to the book of Jeremiah (52:1-34),[3] three deportations to Babylon took place, namely, those following the surrender of Jeconiah (598 B.C.),[4] the suppression of Zedekiah's revolt (587 B.C.),[5] and the assassination of Gedaliah, the Judaean administrator appointed by Nebuchadnezzar (582 B.C.).[6] Baruch would not be among the Jews taken to Babylon in the first two deportations, since he is found with Jeremiah in Jerusalem subsequent to each of these events.[7] Following the assassination of Gedaliah, the

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 170.

[2] Cf. Jer. 51:59-64; cf. also Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 414.

[3] This account closely follows the record in II Kings 24-25.

[4] Cf. II Kgs. 24:12-16.

[5] Cf. II Kgs. 24:20-25:21.

[6] Cf. II Kgs. 25:22-26.

[7] Cf. Jeremiah 39-43.

group who led the revolt fled to Egypt, taking Jeremiah and Baruch with them.[1] Baruch then, was in Egypt in 582 B.C. and, therefore, could not be in Babylon at that time.

The record is silent in regard to the fate of Jeremiah and Baruch after their deportation to Egypt. According to the account of Josephus, Nebuchadnezzar, in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, conducted an expedition against the Egyptians, during which Egypt was overthrown, the reigning Pharoah slain, and a puppet king set up.[2] The conquest of Egypt was followed by a deportation to Babylon. Josephus, however, does not provide a list of the Jews who were taken to Babylon. But according to one Jewish legend,[3] Jeremiah and Baruch, following the conquest of Egypt, were among the deportees led away by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon. Other Jewish legends supply us with questionable information regarding Baruch's activity in Babylon. Baruch not only was an active prophet[4] but, supposedly, was also the teacher of Ezra the

---

[1] Cf. II Kgs. 25:25-26; Jer. 41:1-43:7.

[2] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, translated by Ralph Marcus ("The Loeb Classical Library"; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), X, 180-182.

[3] Seder ʿOlam Rabba 26; see Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 414.

[4] The Seder ʿOlam 20 and the Talmud (Megilla 14b) place Baruch among the prophets and relate that he prophesied in the period following the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. Louis Ginzberg, "Baruch in Rabbinical Literature", The Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 448-449.

scribe,[1] who remained with him in Babylon at the time the edict of Cyrus was issued;[2] Baruch, being weakened by age,[3] was not able to go to Jerusalem.[4] After the death of Baruch, Ezra returned to Jerusalem with the body of his master.[5] The legends centering around Baruch, however, are not without contradictions. One legend, regarded by Kneucker as trustworthy, states that both Jeremiah and Baruch died in Egypt.[6] Another legend relates that Jeremiah alone died in Egypt, and that Baruch, upon the death of his master, moved to Babylon. This journey took place in the twelfth year after the destruction of Jerusalem.[7] Still another legend informs us that Jeremiah was deported to Babylon while Baruch was left behind in

---

[1]Cf. T.K. Cheyne, "Baruch", Encyclopaedia Biblica, edited by T.K. Cheyne, and J. Sutherland Black (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899), I, 491; Cheyne suggests the legend represents an attempt to prove the unbroken transmission of the oral tradition. This legend could account for the association of the passage on wisdom (3:9-4:4) with the name Baruch. Baruch, like Ezra, is seen to have an interest in preserving the Torah entrusted to Israel.

[2]Ezra refused to return to Jerusalem because he did not want to miss the instructions of Baruch; the study of the Torah was considered more important than the rebuilding of the temple (Megilla 16b; see Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 414).

[3]On the basis of Jewish legend, Kneucker estimates that Baruch was 168 years old at the time of his death (op. cit., p. 3).

[4]Midrash Rabba ad Cant. 5:5; see Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 414.

[5]Tradition sets September 18 as the day of Baruch's death; see Kneucker, op. cit., p. 3.

[6]See Kneucker, op. cit., p. 2.

[7]Ibid., pp. 2-3.

Jerusalem.[1] Such conflicting traditions are unreliable. The legendary material, consequently, cannot be used as evidence for Baruch's presence in Babylon.[2] Instead these legends appear to be an attempt to supplement the Biblical tradition with facts concerning which the record is silent. Apart from the book of Baruch, then, we have no conclusive evidence that Baruch was in Babylon. While the possibility remains that Baruch could have journeyed to Babylon after the death of Jeremiah,[3] it seems less probable, in view of the facts presented above, that he did so. In any event, it seems doubtful that he was in Babylon in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Returning to the question raised earlier in regard to the presumed original form of the book, we note the following points: (1) Since there is reason to believe that the passage on wisdom originally contained no reference to the exile, it follows that Bar. 1:1-2 was not originally attached to this section. Baruch's presence in Babylon, subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, would not be an appropriate setting for the material in 3:9 ff. (2) The material in 1:15-3:8, on the

---

[1]See the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 9-12. Baruch is told that Jeremiah will be taken along with other Jews to Babylon, but he was to remain in the ruins of Jerusalem. But Josephus relates another story. When Nebuzaradan, the captain of the Babylonian forces, tried to persuade Jeremiah to go to Babylon, the prophet pleaded to be allowed to live in the ruins of his own country. He was granted permission, and he settled in Mizpah (op. cit., X, 155-158; cf. Jer. 39:11-40:12).

[2]Against F. H. Reusch, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

[3]So W. Stoderl, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

other hand, has an exilic setting and therefore would seem to be the more probable sequel to the introductory verses (1:1-2). (3) Moreover, since the material in Bar. 3:10-13 can be understood as an attempt to adapt the passage on wisdom to the situation of the exile, it would follow that the passage Bar. 3:9,14-4:4 would be added to 1:1-2,15-3:8 and not the reverse. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the passage on wisdom was composed at a time subsequent to the composition of the confessions and prayers; it may have existed in its original form at an earlier date. In Chapter II an approximate date for the passage on wisdom will be offered.

The question of the authorship of Baruch still remains to be discussed. On the basis of the conclusions stated above in connection with the question of the presumed original form of the book there is reason to believe that the passage on wisdom was not written by Baruch the secretary of the prophet Jeremiah, i.e., we no longer have a basis on which to argue for the authorship of Baruch. Additional reasons against the authorship of Baruch are to be found in the views advanced by the author of 3:9-4:4. It can be shown that the wisdom set forth here is of a theological nature,[1] which comes to the fore in post-exilic times.[2] We mention, in particular, the identification of wisdom with the Torah.

It seems doubtful that Baruch was the author of the

---

[1]See Chapter III.

[2]See W. Zimmerli, "The Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology", SJT XVII (1964), 146-158. See Chapter III.

material in 1:15-3:8. It can be shown that the author or redactor of 1:15-3:8 was either dependent on the confessional prayer in Dan. 9:5-19 or on another source (or sources) earlier than the book of Daniel, but later than the time of Baruch.[1] The introductory verses (1:3-14) should also be excluded, since they could not have existed apart from 1:15-3:8.

The material in 4:5-5:9 shows signs of being influenced by the language and style of Deutero-Isaiah[2] and, therefore, makes improbable the view that this passage goes back to Baruch.

Conclusion. Baruch the son of Neriah, and the friend and secretary of the prophet Jeremiah occupied an important place in Jewish legend. Since he was known in Jewish history as the amanuensis of Jeremiah, and was a witness of the closing events of the Judaean kingdom, it would naturally follow that he would write about these events. In view of the evidence presented above, however, it is difficult for one to maintain that Baruch was the author of any portion of the book. There are ~~fewer~~ problems with the view which considers the book a pseudepigraphical work. The book, like other anonymous writings, was assigned to Baruch because of his close association with the prophet Jeremiah, and because he lived at a decisive time in the history of Israel. It is no longer possible to determine who the real authors of the book are.

---

[1] See Chapter II.

[2] See Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

THE QUESTION OF THE DATE OF THE BOOK OF BARUCH

THE PROBLEM

The problem of determining a date for the book of Baruch is as complex as the problem of authorship. The difficulty stems, on the one hand, from the fact that we have before us a diversity of materials, some of which may have enjoyed independent circulation prior to their being added to the book, and, on the other hand, from the fact that the book contains no definite clues which would indicate the time in which the author(s) was writing. The only basis on which one can date the materials is to be found in the literary parallels which the book can be seen to share with other writings. The purpose of this chapter will be to examine the literary relationship between (1) Bar. 1:15-2:19 and Dan. 9:5-19, and (2) Bar. 5:1-9 and Ps. of Sol. 11:1-9, in order to provide a basis from which to determine, on the one hand, the dates for the various materials in the book, and, on the other hand, the date for the final form of the book.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BARUCH 1:15-2:19 AND DANIEL 9:5-19[1]

The content of Bar. 1:15-2:19 shares some very close parallels with the confessional prayer in Dan. 9:5-19. H. Ewald[2] and, more recently, W. Stoderl[3] are among those who believe the prayer in Daniel is an abridgment of the material in Baruch. Against the views of these scholars, O.F. Fritzsche,[4] J.J. Kneucker,[5] C.F. Keil,[6] E. Schürer,[7] C.H. Toy,[8] E.C. Bissell,[9] H.St.J. Thackeray,[10] P. Kraus,[11] C.C. Torrey,[12] R.H. Pfeiffer,[13] B.N. Wambacq,[14] O. Eissfeldt,[15] and others have argued that the confessional prayer in Daniel was copied and

---

[1]The actual prayer(s) continues on to 3:8 but the passages parallel with the prayer in Daniel end with Bar. 2:19.

[2]Op. cit., p. 208, note 6.

[3]Op. cit., pp. 5-9; Kalt (op. cit., p. 4) tends to follow the conclusions of Stoderl.

[4]Op. cit., pp. 181 ff. [5]Op. cit., pp. 32 ff.

[6]Op. cit., p. 753.

[7]History of the Jewish People, div. II, vol. III, p. 191. There are correspondences with the book of Daniel, "which make the employment of it by the author of Baruch indubitable", writes Schürer.

[8]Op. cit., p. 556. [9]Op. cit., p. 422.

[10]"The Greek Translator of Jeremiah", p. 261.

[11]Op. cit., col. 1123. [12]Op. cit., p. 61.

[13]Op. cit., pp. 415-417.

[14]"Les prières de Baruch (1,15-2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)", Biblica XL (1959), 463-475.

[15]Op. cit., p. 593.

expanded by the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8. According to the judgment of J.T. Marshall,[1] and R.H. Charles[2] the author of Daniel did not borrow the prayer from the book of Baruch, nor was the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8 dependent on the book of Daniel for his material; instead, both writers seem to have utilized a third source and to have adapted it in accordance with their own interests.

We shall review the evidence advanced in support of each of these positions, and then indicate the position which we believe contains the more probable solution.

Evidence for the priority of Baruch. Those who begin with the assumption that Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah, was the author of Bar. 1:1-3:8 have no difficulty in settling the question of priority. Since Baruch lived before the book of Daniel was written, it would follow that the author of Daniel borrowed his material from the book of Baruch. But the integrity of Bar. 1:1 ff. is highly questionable; therefore, Bar. 1:1 ff. cannot be used in support of the priority of Baruch. The most recent attempt to prove that the prayer in Daniel was based on the material in Bar. 1:15-2:19 was made by W. Stoderl. The study of the two prayers, however, is only one aspect of the problem which he attempts to solve; his

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 253.

[2] Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments, pp. 217-218.

primary concern is to defend the authenticity of Bar. 1:1-3:8.[1] While he recognizes a diversity of authorship in the book, he, nevertheless, believes that Baruch the son of Neriah was the author of 1:15-3:8. In defence of this position he attempts to show that the author of the book of Daniel reworked the material in Baruch, making changes in harmony with his own interests.[2]

The two prayers are arranged in parallel columns in Greek; the study was based on Swete's third edition of the Septuagint (1905). Stoderl presents the following arguments in support of his position; (1) The object of the prayer has been changed by the author of Daniel in accordance with his own interests. The concern in the confessions and prayers in Baruch centers around the fate of the exiles whereas in the prayer of Daniel primary interest is devoted to the holy city, Jerusalem, and to the temple, which lay in ruins. (2) In Baruch the prayer is uttered by the exiles (first person plural) whereas in Daniel it is offered by the prophet himself (first person singular). (3) Finally, the author of the book of Daniel attempts to make the prayer his own by (a) repeating certain statements for the purpose of emphasis, (b) changing the address to God from the third person to the second person, (c) abbreviating passages in Baruch which are based on

---

[1]Of the twenty-three pages that make up the monograph the author devotes five to the question of the relationship between the prayers in Baruch and Daniel.

[2]Op. cit., p. 5.

Jeremiah, (d) omitting all the details in Baruch, and (e) making additions, some of which serve to clarify a point, etc.[1]

The evidence which Stoderl presents, however, is not convincing for the following reasons: (1) The first argument he cites can be reversed in favor of the priority of Daniel.[2] (2) The second point is not really an argument; it does not necessarily speak in favor of the priority of Baruch, nor can one use the statement against it. (3) Repetition occurs not only in the prayer of Daniel but also in the confessions and prayer of Baruch.[3] (4) Moreover, it is debatable whether the material in Daniel represents an abbreviation of the material in Baruch; it can be also argued that the material in Baruch is an expansion of that in Daniel.[4] (5) Furthermore, insofar as the omissions are concerned, one could observe the same tendency in Baruch.[5]

Evidence for the priority of Daniel. The majority of critics have argued in favor of the priority of Daniel, but few have offered evidence to support this view. Recently, Wambacq has attempted to prove that the prayer in Daniel formed

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 5.

[2] This is one of the arguments Wambacq uses in defence of the priority of the prayer in Daniel. See below.

[3] Cf. 1:15 and 2:6; 1:20 and 2:9; 1:21 and 2:8.

[4] See Oesterley, The Books of the Apocrypha, pp. 497-498.

[5] See below.

the basis for the confessions and prayers in Baruch.[1] In Stoderl's examination a comparison was made between the Greek text of Baruch and the Greek text of Daniel. Wambacq, however, with many other scholars, is convinced that Bar. 1:15-3:8 was composed originally in Hebrew. Therefore, he argues, the question to be resolved is the relationship between the Hebrew text of Baruch and the Hebrew text of Daniel. Even if it could be shown that the Greek translation of the prayer in Daniel was based on the Greek translation of Baruch 1:15-2:19, Wambacq adds, it would not necessarily follow that the Hebrew text of the former was dependent on the Hebrew text of the latter. Instead, the possibility remains that the works would follow in this order: (a) Hebrew text of Daniel, (b) Hebrew text of Baruch, (c) Greek translation of Baruch, (d) Greek translation of Daniel.[2]

On the basis of a comparison of the two prayers the following evidence appears in favor of the priority of Daniel:[3] (1) In the passages where the prayer in Baruch contains material not found in the prayer of Daniel it can be shown frequently that the redactor of Baruch has inserted material from other Old Testament passages.

---

[1] "Les prières de Baruch (1,15-2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)", pp. 465 ff.

[2] Ibid.

[3] I am indebted to Wambacq's article cited above and to James Keith Zink's work. The latter is an unpublished dissertation at Duke University, 1963, entitled "The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha". Pages 89-119 deal with the book of Baruch.

(a)

Baruch 1:15-17	Daniel 9:7-8
Τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, ἡμῖν δὲ αἰσχύνη τῶν προσώπων ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη, ἀνθρώπῳ Ιουδα καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ιερουσαλημ	σοί, κύριε, ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἡμῖν ἡ αἰσχύνη τοῦ προσώπου κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην ἀνθρώποις Ιουδα καὶ καθημένοις Ιερουσαλημ
(16) καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν	(8) καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ δυνάσταις
	Jeremiah 39:32 (MT 32:32)
καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τοῖς προφήταις ἡμῶν	καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ προφῆται αὐτῶν
	Daniel 9:8 (continued)
καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, (17) ὧν ἡμάρτομεν ἐναντίον κυρίου	καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἡμάρτομέν σοι

(b)

Baruch 1:19	Jeremiah 11:7-8[1],
ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἐξήγαγε κύριος τοὺς πατέρας	הַיּוֹם הַעֲלוֹתִי אֹתָם

[1]This passage is not found in the Septuagint version of Jeremiah. Although there is not exact verbal agreement between Baruch 1:19 and Jeremiah 11:7-8, the agreement is close enough to show that the writer was following the Hebrew text. This would add further evidence to the view that the material in Bar. 1:15-3:8 was probably written originally in Hebrew. It is possible that the writer could have followed the Hebrew text while writing in Greek, but it is less likely that he did.

ἡμῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου,
καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης

ἡμεθα ἀπειθοῦντες
πρὸς κύριον θεὸν ἡμῶν

וְעַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
עָבְרוּ אֶת־תּוֹרָתֶךָ

וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ בְּקֹלֶךָ

(c)

Baruch 1:20

καὶ ἐκολλήθη εἰς ἡμᾶς
τὰ κακὰ καὶ ἡ ἀρά,
ἣν συνέταξε κύριος τῷ
Μωυσῆ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐξήγαγε
τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν
ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου....

Daniel 9:11

καὶ ἐπῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
ἡ κατάρα καὶ ὁ ὅρκος
ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ
Μωσῆ παιδὸς τοῦ θεοῦ....

Jeremiah 11:4

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἀνήγαγον
αὐτοὺς
ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου....

(d)

Baruch 1:21-22

καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς
φωνῆς κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν
κατὰ πάντας τοὺς λόγους
τῶν προφητῶν, ὧν
ἀπέστειλε πρὸς ἡμᾶς

(22) καὶ ᾠχόμεθα
ἕκαστος ἐν διανοίᾳ

Daniel 9:10

καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς
φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
κατακολουθῆσαι τῷ νόμῳ
σου, ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον
Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν διὰ τῶν
παίδων σου τῶν προφητῶν

Jeremiah 16:12-13
(MT 16:11-12)

...καὶ ἰδοὺ ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε
ἕκαστος ὀπίσω τῶν ἀρεστῶν

καρδίας αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς

ἐργάζεσθαι θεοῖς ἑτέροις

τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν τῆς πονηρᾶς

δουλεύσετε ἐκεῖ θεοῖς ἑτέροις

(e)

Baruch 2:1-3

καὶ ἔστησε κύριος
τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,
ὃν ἐλάλησεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ
ἐπὶ τοὺς δικαστὰς ἡμῶν
τοὺς δικάσαντας τὸν Ισραηλ

καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἡμῶν
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἡμῶν

καὶ ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον Ισραηλ

(2) οὐκ ἐποιήθη ὑποκάτω
παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθὰ
ἐποίησεν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ
κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν
τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ

(3) τοῦ φαγεῖν ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον

Daniel 9:12-13

καὶ ἔστησεν ἡμῖν
τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ,
ὅσα ἐλάλησεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ
ἐπὶ τοὺς κριτὰς ἡμῶν,
ὅσα ἔκρινας ἡμῖν

Daniel 9:6

... ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἡμῶν
καὶ δυνάστας ἡμῶν
καὶ πατέρας ἡμῶν
καὶ παντὶ ἔθνει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

Daniel 9:12-13 (continued)

... οὐκ ἐγενήθη ὑπὸ
τὸν οὐρανὸν καθότι
ἐγενήθη ἐν Ιερουσαλημ
(13) κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα
ἐν διαθήκῃ Μωσῆ....

Deuteronomy 28:53[1]

καὶ φάγῃ τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς

---

[1]Baruch gives the citation as coming from the Law but the form of Baruch 2:3 is closer to Jeremiah 19:9 than it is to Deuteronomy 28:3. Jeremiah 19:9 reads: καὶ ἔδονται τὰς σάρκας τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας τῶν θυγατέρων αὐτῶν .

σάρκας υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ	κοιλίας σου,
ἄνθρωπον σάρκας θυγατρὸς	κρέα υἱῶν σου καὶ
αὐτοῦ	θυγατέρων σου ....

In the five examples cited above one can see close agreement in wording in a number of instances. If one were to remove the passages in Baruch which are parallel with those in Jeremiah, one would observe that the sequence of thought in the prayer of Baruch is generally the same as that found in the prayer of Daniel.

(2) In the passages where the prayer of Daniel contains material not found in the prayer in Baruch it can be shown in several instances that the redactor of Baruch has made these omissions in accordance with his own particular interests. Three examples will be cited which illustrate this practice.

(a)

Baruch 2:13	Daniel 9:16
ἀποστραφήτω ὁ θυμός	...ἀποστραφήτω ὁ θυμός
σου ἀφ' ἡμῶν	σου καὶ ἡ ὀργή σου
	ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεώς σου
	Ιερουσαλημ ὄρους τοῦ ἁγίου
	σου

(b)

Baruch 2:14	Daniel 9:17
εἰσάκουσον, κύριε,	καὶ νῦν ἐπάκουσον, δέσποτα,
τῆς προσευχῆς ἡμῶν	τῆς προσευχῆς τοῦ παιδός σου
καὶ τῆς δεήσεως ἡμῶν	καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δεήσεις μου,
καὶ ἐξέλου ἡμᾶς	
	καὶ ἐπιβλεψάτω τὸ πρόσωπόν

σου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν
σου τὸ ἔρημον
ἕνεκεν τῶν δούλων σου,
δέσποτα

ἕνεκεν σοῦ
καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν χάριν κατὰ
πρόσωπον τῶν ἀποικισάντων
ἡμᾶς

(c)

Baruch 2:16-19

κύριε, κάτιδε ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου
τοῦ ἁγίου σου καὶ ἐννόησον
εἰς ἡμᾶς
κλῖνον, κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου
καὶ ἄκουσον
(17) ἄνοιξον ὀφθαλμούς σου
καὶ ἴδε
ὅτι οὐκ οἱ τεθνηκότες ἐν
τῷ ᾅδῃ... δώσουσι δόξαν
καὶ δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ,
(18) ἀλλὰ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ λυπουμένη
... δώσουσί σοι δόξαν καὶ
δικαιοσύνην, κύριε

(19) ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ δικαιώματα
τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν

Daniel 9:18-19

πρόσχες, κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου
καὶ ἐπάκουσόν μου
ἄνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου
καὶ ἴδὲ

τὴν ἐρήμωσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς
πόλεώς σου, ἐφ' ἧς ἐκεκλήθη
τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῆς
οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῖς δικαιοσύναις
ἡμῶν

βασιλέων ἡμῶν
ἡμεῖς καταβάλλομεν τὸν ἔλεον ἡμῶν κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου, κύριε, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν

ἡμεῖς δεόμεθα ἐν παῖς προσευχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐνώπιόν σου, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ σὸν ἔλεος,
(19) κύριε, σὺ ἱλάτευσον... ὅτι τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπεκλήθη ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν σου Σιων καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου Ισραηλ

In the first two examples the material in the prayer of Daniel which is not found in Baruch has to do with the desecration of the city. An important variant between the text of Theodotion and the text of the Septuagint is found in 9:17. Instead of τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν σου "your holy mountain" (a reference to Jerusalem; see 9:16), the text of Theodotion, in agreement with the Masoretic text, reads: τὸ ἁγίασμά σου "your sanctuary". It is Wambacq's contention that the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8 omitted the references to the city and the temple, and focused attention solely on the desolate condition of the exiles.[1] This leads him to the conclusion that the redactor of Baruch was living at a time when neither the city nor the temple was in ruins (cf. Bar. 2:16, κύριε, κάτιδε ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἁγίου σου καὶ ἐννόησον εἰς ἡμᾶς) and, hence, it was fitting to remove all references pertaining to such a condition.[2] Further support for Wambacq's view may be seen in the third example.

---

[1] "Les prières de Baruch (1,15-2:19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)", pp. 468, 475. This was pointed out earlier by Marshall, op. cit., p. 252.

[2] Ibid., pp. 470, 475.

Here we note in Baruch an elaborate description of the miserable plight of the captives instead of the reference to the desolate city found in the prayer of Daniel.[1]

(3) All of the differences between the two prayers cannot be classified under the two categories given above, i.e., as insertions from other Old Testament passages made by the redactor of Baruch or as omissions resulting from the redactor's concern to adapt the prayer to his own situation. There are a number of less significant differences between the Greek text of Baruch and the Septuagint text of Daniel. In not a few instances, however, the Greek text of Baruch agrees with Theodotion's text of Daniel against the text of the Septuagint. This may be seen in the following examples:

(a)

Baruch 1:15	Daniel 9:7
ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη	(Θ) ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη (LXX) κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην

(b)

Baruch 1:16	Daniel 9:8
καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν	(Θ) καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν (LXX) καὶ συνάσταις

(c)

Baruch 1:18	Daniel 9:10
οἷς ἔδωκε κατὰ	(Θ) οἷς ἔδωκεν κατὰ

---

[1]Wambacq fails to mention the passage 2:26 which contains an allusion to the desolate condition of the temple: "And you have set the house, which is called by your name, as this day, because of the wickedness of the house of Israel and of Judah". The parallel to this passage, however, is not

πρόσωπον ἡμῶν

πρόσωπον ἡμῶν
(LXX) ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ
καὶ ἡμῶν

(d)

Baruch 2:1

καὶ ἔστησε κύριος
τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ

Daniel 9:12

(θ) καὶ ἔστησεν
τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ
(LXX) καὶ ἔστησεν ἡμῖν
τὰ προστάγματα αὐτῶ

(e)

Baruch 2:2

ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Daniel 9:12

(θ) ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
(LXX) ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν

(f)

Baruch 2:2

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ

Daniel 9:13

(θ) ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ
(LXX) ἐν διαθήκῃ Μωσῆ

(g)

Baruch 2:9

καὶ ἐγρηγόρησε κύριος

Daniel 9:14

(θ) καὶ ἐγρηγόρησεν κύριος
(LXX) καὶ ἠγρύπνησε κύριος

(h)

Baruch 2:11

ὃς ἐξήγαγες τὸν λαόν σου
ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου

Daniel 9:15

(θ) ὃς ἐξήγαγες τὸν λαόν σου
ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου

---

found in the prayer of Daniel but in Jer. 7:12-15; this may account for the inconsistency.

ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ

ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ
(LXX) ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν τὸν λαόν σου
ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
τῷ βραχίονί

(i)

Baruch 2:16	Daniel 9:18
κλῖνον ... ἄκουσον	(Θ) κλῖνον ... ἄκουσον
	(LXX) πρόσχες ... ἐπάκουσόν

It is generally recognized that Theodotion's text of Daniel corresponds more closely to the Masoretic text than the text of Daniel preserved in the Septuagint.[1] According to the judgment of A. Rahlfs, Theodotion's text is a reworking of the Septuagint on the basis of the original text.[2] Whether or not this has been proven is not the concern of this study. It is of interest to note, however, that in the nine instances given above, where Theodotion's text differs from the text of the Septuagint, the former follows the Masoretic text against the Septuagint. The evidence is as follows:

Masoretic text	Theodotion's text	Septuagint
(a) Daniel 9:7		
כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה	ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη	κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην
(b) Daniel 9:8		
לְשָׂרֵינוּ	τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν	δυνάσταις

[1] Alfred Rahlfs, History of the Septuagint Text, Septuaginta, (seventh edition; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962), vol. I, p. xxvii.

[2] Ibid.

(c) Daniel 9:10

אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לְפָנָיו	οἷς ἔδωκεν κατὰ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν	ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν

(d) Daniel 9:12

וַיָּקֶם	καὶ ἔστησεν	καὶ ἔστησεν ἡμῖν
אֶת־דְּבָרָיו[1]	τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ	τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ

(e) Daniel 9:12

תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם	ὑποκάτω παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν

(f) Daniel 9:13

בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ	ἐν διαθήκῃ Μωσῆ

(g) Daniel 9:14

וַיִּשְׁקֹד	καὶ ἐγρηγόρησεν	καὶ ἠγρύπνησε
יְהוָה	κύριος	κύριος

(h) Daniel 9:15

אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ	ὃς ἐξήγαγες	ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν
אֶת־עַמְּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ	τὸν λαόν σου	τὸν λαόν σου
מִצְרַיִם	ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου	ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
בְּיָד הַזְּקָה	ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ	τῷ βραχίονί

(i) Daniel 9:18

הַטֵּה...וּשְׁמָע	κλῖνον... καὶ ἄκουσον	πρόσχες... καὶ ἐπάκουσον

The evidence presented above shows that the Greek text of Baruch is closer to Theodotion's text of Daniel than it is

---

[1] The Kethibh is דברין ; the Qere is דְּבָרָו . See Rudolf Kittel (ed.) Biblica Hebraica (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959).

to the text of Daniel preserved in the Septuagint. Furthermore, in the instances where the Greek text of Baruch agrees with the text of Theodotion against the Septuagint, it was shown that the former follows the Masoretic text. Thus, there is reason to believe that the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8 has followed the Masoretic text of Daniel. There are less difficulties with this view than with the assumption that the author of the prayer in Daniel followed the Hebrew text of Baruch. For we have no way of determining with accuracy the presumed Hebrew text of Baruch. It is not enough to reconstruct the Hebrew text on the basis of the Greek, since we do not know how faithful the Greek translator was in following the original.

(4) Finally, some of the differences between the prayer in Baruch and the prayer in Daniel are due to the tendency of the redactor of Baruch to paraphrase Scripture. This may be seen in two instances:

(a)

Baruch 1:20	Daniel 9:11
καὶ ἐκολλήθη εἰς ἡμᾶς	καὶ ἐπῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
τὰ κακὰ καὶ ἡ ἀρὰ,	ἡ κατάρα καὶ ὁ ὅρκος
ἣν συνέταξε κύριος τῷ	ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ
Μωυσῆ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ	Μωσῆ παίδος τοῦ θεοῦ

(b)

Baruch 1:21-22	Daniel 9:10
καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς	καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν τῆς
φωνῆς κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν	φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
κατὰ πάντας τοὺς λόγους	κατακολουθῆσαι τῷ νόμῳ σου,

τῶν προφητῶν, ὧν ἀπέστειλε πρὸς ἡμᾶς	ᾧ ἔδωκας ἐνώπιον Μωσῆ καὶ ἡμῶν διὰ τῶν παίδων σου τῶν προφητῶν

The tendency to paraphrase may be seen also in the redactor's use of other Old Testament Scripture.

(a)

Baruch 2:21	Jeremiah 34:10 (MT 27:12)[1]
Κλίνατε τὸν ὦμον ὑμῶν καὶ ἐργάσασθε τῷ βασιλεῖ βαβυλῶνος καὶ καθίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἔδωκα τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν	Εἰσαγάγετε τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν καὶ ἐργάσασθε τῷ βασιλεῖ βαβυλῶνος

(b)

Baruch 2:23	Jeremiah 7:34
ἐκλείψειν ποιήσω ἐκ πόλεων Ιουδα καὶ ἔξωθεν Ιερουσαλημ φωνὴν εὐφροσύνης καὶ φωνὴν χαρμοσύνης, φωνὴν νυμφίου καὶ φωνὴν νύμφης, καὶ ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ εἰς ἄβατον ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων	καὶ καταλύσω ἐκ πόλεων Ιουδα καὶ ἐκ διόδων Ιερουσαλημ φωνὴν εὐφραινομένων καὶ φωνὴν χαιρόντων, φωνὴν νυμφίου καὶ φωνὴν νύμφης, ὅτι εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ

(c)

Baruch 2:25	Jeremiah 43:30 (MT 36:30)
... ἐστιν ἐξερριμμένα	... ἔσται ἐρριμμένον ἐν

[1]The Hebrew text reads:
הָבִיא אֶת־עֲוֹנֵכֶם אֲשֶׁר־בָּבֶל עֹשֶׂה אֹתוֹ וַעֲמוֹ וְחָדֵר
Baruch 2:21 may be a paraphrase of the Hebrew text.

τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας	τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας
καὶ τῷ παγετῷ τῆς νυκτός,	καὶ ἐν τῷ παγετῷ τῆς νυκτός
	Jeremiah 39:36 (MT 32:36)
καὶ ἀπεθάνοσαν ἐν πόνοις	----------
πονηροῖς, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν	ἐν μαχαίρᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ
ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀποστολῇ	ἐν ἀποστολῇ

On the basis of the evidence presented above it would be difficult to argue in favor of the priority of the material in Baruch. One can, however, defend the priority of the prayer in Daniel with less difficulty.

Evidence for a common source. A third alternative has been offered, namely, that the prayers in Baruch and in Daniel are not dependent upon each other, but instead, are modelled after ancient liturgical forms which came into existence some time during the exilic or early post-exilic period. Those who hold this view offer the following arguments: (1) The confessional prayer in Daniel did not belong to the original form of the book, but represents a later addition.[1] (2) The close agreement in wording between Dan. 9:4-19, Neh. 1:5 ff., 9:6 ff., and Bar. 1:15 ff. shows that the writers of each of these passages drew from existing liturgical forms, and adapted them in accordance with their own peculiar interests.[2]

---

[1] R.H. Charles, The Book of Daniel ("The New Century Bible"; Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, n.d.), pp. 96-97.

[2] Ibid.

The evidence advanced in support of these arguments will be reviewed in the following manner: First, we shall consider the evidence on the basis of which the prayer is said to be an interpolation. Secondly, we shall examine the literary parallels in the prayers of Daniel, Nehemiah, and Baruch, as well as a passage in the prayer of dedication offered by Solomon. An evaluation of the evidence will follow the presentation.

The evidence for Dan. 9:5-19 as an interpolation is as follows: (1) Unnecessary repetitions in the context of Daniel's prayer betray the hand of an interpolator. This may be seen in verses 3-4 and 20-21.

> Verse 3: Then I turned to the Lord God [Adonai Elohim] to inquire by prayer and supplications with fasting and sackcloth and ashes. Verse 4: And I prayed to Yahweh my God and made confession and said....
>
> Verse 20: And while I was speaking and praying and confessing my sin and the sin of my people, and presenting my petition before Yahweh my God, on behalf of the holy mountain of God -- [verse 21] and while I was speaking in prayer....

These repetitions, it is argued, are the result of the joining of the confessional prayer (9:5-19) to the main part of the narrative (9:1-3, 21-27) at a time subsequent to the composition of the latter.[1] (2) The theme of the prayer in Daniel does not correspond to the context. The content of the prayer has to do with the confession of sin and the request for forgiveness and deliverance whereas the narrative, which represents the divine response to the prophet's prayer, is concerned

---

[1]Charles, The Book of Daniel, p. 96.

with the explanation of the prophecy of Jeremiah (9:24-27). The context, therefore,does not require a national confession of sin, but a prayer for illumination.[1] (3) In the present context the prayer supposedly is offered by the prophet Daniel in exile. But according to the contents of the prayer, this liturgical formula was written in Palestine and not in a foreign land:

> To you, O Lord, belongs righteousness, but to us shame as this day -- to the men of Judah and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to all Israel, those who are near and those who are far away in all the lands where you have banished them (9:7).

The expression "those who are near", it is held, can only refer to the Jews in Palestine, in contrast to "those who are far away in all the lands...." This may also be observed in verse 16:

> O Lord, according to all your righteousness let your anger and your wrath turn away from your city Jerusalem, your holy mountain; because of our sins and the iniquities of our fathers Jerusalem and your people have become a reproach to all those who are round about us.

The words underlined show that the prayer was written by a Palestinian who was living in his native land.[2] (4) The name Yahweh appears several times in the prayer (9:8,10,13,14) but is not found elsewhere in the book except for 9:2 and 4, where in all probability it was inserted by the hand which added the prayer.[3] (5) In the confessional prayer the request is made

---

[1] J.A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel ("The International Critical Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 362.

[2] Charles, The Book of Daniel, p. 96.

[3] Ibid.

for immediate deliverance. But according to the verses immediately preceding (9:2 f.), Daniel was aware that the deliverance, in accordance with Jeremiah's prophecy, lay in the distant future:[1]

> In the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, considered in the scrolls the number of the years which, according to the word of Yahweh to Jeremiah the prophet, must be fulfilled for the desolation of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years.

The literary parallels between Daniel 9 and Nehemiah 1 and 9 are the following:

(a)

Nehemiah 1:5[2]	Daniel 9:4
אָנָּא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאֵל	אָנָּא אֲדֹנָי הָאֵל
הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא	הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא
שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וָחֶסֶד	שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד
לְאֹהֲבָיו וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו	לְאֹהֲבָיו וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו

(b)

Nehemiah 9:32	Daniel 9:8
	יְהוָה לָנוּ בֹּשֶׁת הַפָּנִים
לְמַלְכֵינוּ לָשָׂרֵינוּ	לְמַלְכֵינוּ לָשָׂרֵינוּ
וּלְכֹהֲנֵינוּ וּלְנְבִיאֵינוּ	
וְלַאֲבֹתֵינוּ וְלְכָל עַמֶּךָ	וְלַאֲבֹתֵינוּ אֲשֶׁר חָטָאנוּ לָךְ

(c)

Nehemiah 9:10	Daniel 9:15
וַתַּעַשׂ-לְךָ שֵׁם כְּהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	וַתַּעַשׂ-לְךָ שֵׁם כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה

---

[1] Charles, The Book of Daniel, p. 96.

[2] A similar form of this address appears in Nehemiah 9:32.

The literary parallels between Baruch 1:15ff. and II Esdras 9 and 19 (MT Nehemiah 1 and 9) are as follows:

(a)

Baruch 1:15-16	II Esdras 19:32
ἡμῖν...	ἡμᾶς
ἀνθρώπῳ Ιουδα καὶ	
τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ιερουσαλημ	
καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν	καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἡμῶν
καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἡμῶν	καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἡμῶν
καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἡμῶν	καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἡμῶν
καὶ τοῖς προφήταις ἡμῶν	καὶ τοὺς προφήτας ἡμῶν
καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν	καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν

(b)

Baruch 2:11	II Esdras 9:15
καὶ νῦν,	
κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ...	κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ
	II Esdras 19:10
καὶ ἐποίησας σεαυτῷ ὄνομα	καὶ ἐποίησας σεαυτῷ ὄνομα
ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη	ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη

In addition to these passages we note also some affinity between Baruch 2 and III Kings 8 (MT I Kings 8):

(a)

Baruch 2:12	III Kings 8:47
ἡμάρτομεν ἠσεβήσαμεν	Ἡμάρτομεν ἠνομήσαμεν
ἠδικήσαμεν	ἠδικήσαμεν

(b)

Baruch 2:30	III Kings 8:47,48

...καὶ ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἐν γῇ ἀποικισμοῦ αὐτῶν	καὶ ἐπιστρέψουσιν καρδίας αὐτῶν... ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν

The arguments outlined above in support of a common source for the prayers in Daniel and in Baruch are not free of problems. First, not all literary critics are convinced that the prayer in Daniel is a later interpolation.[1] J.A. Montgomery, for example, believes the author of the book of Daniel inserted the prayer into the narrative in order to express the piety of the Jews, who chose to remain loyal to the Torah in the face of persecution.[2] More recently, N. Porteous has taken a position similar to Montgomery's.[3] It is possible, then, that the prayer existed in an earlier form before being added to the book of Daniel, and that it was added by the author or the redactor, who was responsible for the compilation of the stories and the visions in the book. Since the prayer is found in the Hebrew text of Daniel it would not be unreasonable to suggest that it was inserted -- if not by the

---

[1] C.F. Keil, against Hitzig, Ewald, and others, defends the authenticity of Daniel's prayer. His arguments are presented in The Book of the Prophet Daniel, translated by M.G. Easton, ("Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament"; Edingburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1891), pp. 326-327. Cf. also A.A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1892), p. 150.

[2] Op. cit., p. 361 f. Montgomery also believes that the prayer of Baruch was modelled on the prayer of Daniel.

[3] Daniel: A Commentary ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,1965), p. 137. Porteous considers the material in Baruch to be dependent on Daniel also.

the author or redactor of the book -- by another hand at an early date prior to the Greek translation of the book. According to Charles, the confessional prayer would be inserted at a time prior to the additions to the book preserved in the Septuagint, such as the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children.[1] It is not possible, however, to determine an exact date for the latter.[2]

Secondly, the evidence does not show that the prayer in Daniel is dependent on the earlier prayers of Nehemiah. The parallel wording in the address to God (Dan. 9:4 and Neh. 1:5) can hardly be considered sufficient evidence for this conclusion. It is quite possible that the prayer was modelled after the liturgical forms of the Synagogue. But, if there was an ancient prayer which served as a model for Daniel's prayer, the former is no longer extant today.

Finally, one can see parallels between the prayers in Daniel and in Baruch, on the one hand, and those in Nehemiah 1 and 9, etc., on the other hand, only in a few instances. The close agreement in wording is to be observed in the passages in Baruch parallel with those in Daniel. Thus it is quite possible for the prayer in Daniel to be a later interpolation, which was modelled on ancient liturgical forms, and, at the same time, one which was edited by the redactor of

---

[1]Charles, The Book of Daniel, p. 97.

[2]Cf. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 590.

Baruch.[1]

Conclusions. Close parallels between the prayer in Daniel and the prayer in Baruch have been observed in a number of passages. The close agreement between the two prayers can be accounted for best by supposing that one writer drew from the work of the other or that both writers were following a third source common to both, but one which is no longer extant today. The thesis of Ewald and Stoderl (the prayer in Daniel is an abridgment of the material in Baruch) seems less probable for several reasons: (1) In a number of instances where the prayer in Baruch contains material not found in Daniel, it was shown that the redactor of Baruch had taken this material from other Old Testament passages. Moreover, it was shown that this additional material was not added to one section of the prayer but was interspersed throughout the material parallel with the prayer in Daniel. (2) In a number of examples where the prayer in Baruch does not have material found in the prayer of Daniel, the reason for the missing material can be

---

[1]Jean Steinmann regards the prayer of Daniel as a later interpolation inserted into the text by an inspired scribe and, one which was taken and expanded by the author of the first part of Baruch (Daniel [Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1961], p. 123). Cf. the statement of P.J. de Menasce:"Elle [la prière] est à rapprocher de la prière d'Azarias, en 3:25-45, et elle a servi de modele à Baruch, 1 et 2 (Daniel ["La Sainte Bible"; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1954], p. 67). Cf. also Pfeiffer, who recognizes the indebtedness of Baruch to Daniel, and, at the same time, is open to the possibility that the redactor of Baruch borrowed material from the prayer in Daniel before the latter was inserted into the book of Daniel. He refers to the prayer in Baruch as "a specimen of a favorite literary device" (op. cit., pp. 415-416).

found in the particular interests of the redactor. The material missing in Baruch can be seen, then, as deliberate omissions made by the redactor in accordance with his own concerns. (3) Close agreement was observed, in a number of passages, between the Greek text of Baruch and the Masoretic text of Daniel against the text of Daniel preserved in the Septuagint. It is possible, in these particular instances, that the text of Baruch represents a more accurate rendering of the original text of Daniel or, at least, a Hebrew text similar to the one preserved by the Masoretes, as well as the one represented in Theodotion's text. (4) In some cases, the differences between the two prayers could be attributed to the tendency, on the part of the redactor of Baruch, to paraphrase Scripture. This tendency could be observed elsewhere in the redactor's use of material from the book of Jeremiah.

It would seem more probable, therefore, that the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8 either reworked the prayer in Daniel or another source which was common to both. The present writer is inclined toward the first position, since the weight of evidence seems to fall in this direction. In this way one can account for the differences between the two prayers, as well as the close agreement in wording. Moreover, in Bar. 1:15-3:8 one finds the redactor drawing material from the book of Jeremiah, the book of Deuteronomy, and other Old Testament passages. It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that he probably drew material also from the book of Daniel. The passage Bar. 1:15-3:8 would then appear as a mosaic of Old Testament texts, having very little original material.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BARUCH 5:1-9 AND PSALM OF SOLOMON 11:1-9

The agreement of Baruch 5 with Psalm of Solomon 11 was first observed by E. Geiger.[1] As in the case of the prayers of Baruch and Daniel, scholarly opinion is divided on the solution to this problem. On the one hand, H.E. Ryle and M.R. James,[2] followed by A.A. Bevan,[3] J.T. Marshall,[4] O.C. Whitehouse,[5] and W.O.E. Oesterley,[6] among others, have concluded that the material in Baruch is dependent on the Psalm of Solomon. R. Kittel,[7] E. Schürer,[8] C. Steuernagel[9] and A. Bentzen[10] also are inclined to defend the priority of the

---

[1] Der Psalter Salomos (Augsburg, 1871), p. 137; this information was taken from W. Pesch, "Die Abhängigkeit des 11. salomonischen Psalms vom letzten Kapitel des Buches Baruch", ZAW LXVII (1956), p. 252.

[2] Psalms of the Pharisees Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon (Cambridge: University Press, 1891), pp. lxxii ff.; this information was taken from O.C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 573.

[3] Op. cit., p. 494.

[4] Op. cit., p. 253.

[5] Op. cit., pp. 572-574.

[6] The Books of the Apocrypha, pp. 505-506.

[7] Die Psalmen Salomos, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, II, 141.

[8] History of the Jewish People, div. II, vol. III, p. 192.

[9] Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das AT (Tübingen, 1912), p. 791; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[10] Op. cit., p. 232.

Psalm. On the other hand, A. Hilgenfeld,[1] E. König,[2] J. Goettsberger,[3] W. Rothstein,[4] E. Kalt,[5] C.C. Torrey,[6] L. Dennefeld,[7] V. Hamp,[8] W. Pesch,[10] and O. Eissfeldt[11] have argued in favor of the priority of Baruch. A third source common to the passage in Baruch and the Psalm would be suggested by Strack-Zöckler,[12] J.J. Kneucker,[13] R.H. Charles,[14] H.St.J. Thackeray,[15] and R.H. Pfeiffer.[16] Most scholars tend to express their views without supplying sufficient evidence to sup-

---

[1] Zeitschr. f. wiss, Theo. XXII (1879),p. 454; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[2] Op. cit., p. 485.

[3] Einleitung in das AT (Freiburg, 1928), p. 309; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[4] Op. cit., p. 215.

[5] Op. cit., p. 4.

[6] Op. cit., p. 62.

[7] Les Grands Prophetes, p. 437; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[8] Baruch, p. 5; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[9] Die Entstehung des AT (München, 1953), XXVI, 333; taken from Pesch, loc. cit.

[10] Op. cit., pp. 251-263.

[11] Op. cit., p. 593.

[12] Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den hl. Schriften, p. 414; taken from Pesch, op. cit., p. 252.

[13] Op. cit., pp. 43-44, note 11.

[14] See Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 422.

[15] The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, pp. 106-107.

[16] Op. cit., p. 422.

port them. With the exception of Ryle and James,[1] very little evidence has been offered in defence of the priority of the Psalm. This would be due partly to the influence of other conclusions reached earlier in connection with the original language and date of both writings.[2] It is generally held that the Psalm of Solomon was originally composed in Hebrew,[3] while the material in Baruch parallel to the Psalm was written in Greek.[4] Since the verbal coincidences between the two writings are found in the Greek,[5] the question of the order of dependence would appear to be settled: the author of Bar. 5:1-9 copied from the Solomonic Psalter some time after the latter was translated into Greek. Thus Schürer writes: "The dependence must, by reason of the psalm-like character and the probably primitive Hebrew of the Solomonic Psalter, be sought for on the side of the Book of Baruch."[6] Moreover, the date assigned to the material in Baruch would be some time after

---

[1]This work is not found in the Duke Library and is not accessible through the Inter-Library Loan System; consequently, I have had to rely solely on the judgments of other scholars.

[2]See Torrey, op. cit., p. 62 for this criticism.

[3]See Eissfeldt, op. cit., p.611.

[4]See Chapter I of the dissertation where the problem of the original language of the book was alluded to.

[4]This will be shown below. There is no point in reconstructing the Hebrew text of the Psalm to make comparisons with the Greek text of Baruch, since we have no way of determining how faithful the Greek translator of the Psalm had followed the text.

[6]History of the Jewish People, div. II, vol. III, p. 192.

A.D. 70[1] whereas the date of the Psalm would be in the middle of the first century B.C.[2] Consequently, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the verbal agreement between the two passages would be due to the dependence of Baruch on the Psalm, since the latter would be the earlier document. But the question of the original language of Baruch and that of the date is resolved differently by scholars,[3] and, therefore, must not be allowed to influence one's decision on the question of the priority of the material.[4] The same criticism applies to those who defend the priority of Baruch by appealing to an earlier date than that suggested for the Psalm.[5] Since the dates assigned to the writings can be at most only tentative,[6] the question of priority can be settled best on the basis of a comparison of both writings with each other. The most recent and thorough treatment of the problem is the work of Pesch, which ends in favor of the priority of Baruch.[7]

---

[1] See below.

[2] See Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 613

[3] For the question of the original language of the book see Chapter I; for the various dates assigned to the book see below.

[4] This point is given special emphasis by Pesch, op. cit., pp. 254 ff.

[5] For example, those who attribute this section to Baruch are inclined to feel the order of dependence was settled.

[6] See Pesch, op. cit., pp. 254-255.

[7] Ibid., pp. 262-263.

The literary relationship of the two writings can be seen best by arranging the parallel verses in column form.[1]

Psalm of Solomon 11	Baruch 5
(2) στῆθι, Ιερουσαλημ,	(5) Ιερουσαλημ...στῆθι
ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ	ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ ...
καὶ ἴδε	καὶ ἴδε
τὰ τέκνα σου	σου συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν	ἀπὸ ἡλίου δυσμῶν
συνηγμένα...	ἕως ἀνατολῶν
ὑπὸ κυρίου	τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ ἁγίου
(4) ὄρη ὑψηλὰ ἐταπείνωσεν	(7)... ταπεινοῦσθαι πᾶν ὄρος
	ὑψηλὸν...
εἰς ὁμαλισμὸν αὐτοῖς ...	εἰς ὁμαλισμὸν τῆς γῆς...
(5) οἱ δρυμοὶ ἐσκίασαν...	(8) ἐσκίασαν ... οἱ δρυμοὶ
πᾶν ξύλον εὐωδίας	καὶ πᾶν ξύλον εὐωδίας
ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός	... προστάγματι τοῦ θεοῦ
(6) ἵνα παρέλθῃ Ισραηλ	(7) ἵνα βαδίσῃ Ισραηλ
ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ	ἀσφαλῶς τῇ
δόξης θεοῦ αὐτῶν	τοῦ θεοῦ δόξῃ
(7) ἔνδυσαι, Ιερουσαλημ,	(1[b]) ἔνδυσαι
τὰ ἱμάτια	τὴν εὐπρέπειαν
τῆς δόξης σου	τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξης...
ἑτοίμασον	(1[a]) ἔκδυσαι, Ιερουσαλημ,
τὴν στολὴν τοῦ ἁγιάσματός...	τὴν στολὴν τοῦ πένθους...

[1] Other parallels have been cited between the book of Baruch and the Solomonic Psalter, namely, Bar. 4:20 and Ps. of Sol. 2:21,22; Bar. 4:26 and Ps. of Sol. 8:19 (see O.C. Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 573).

While there is close verbal agreement between the two passages in a number of instances, the order of the material is disrupted throughout so that there is no single verse which corresponds word for word with the other, nor any two verses which follow consecutively the order of the other. But this does not rule out the possibility of a direct literary relationship between the two passages. It is generally recognized that the material in Baruch and the Psalm is derived ultimately from Deutero-Isaiah.[1] But there is closer verbal agreement between Baruch and the Psalm than there is between each of the passages, on the one hand, and any one passage, or combination of passages, in Deutero-Isaiah, on the other hand. In several instances the wording in the Psalm, which differs from the wording in Baruch, agrees with the wording in Deutero-Isaiah.[2] But even in these passages the verbal agreement between the Psalm of Solomon and Deutero-Isaiah is not extensive.[3]

Psalm of Solomon 11:2b	Isaiah 43:5b
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν	ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ...
καὶ δυσμῶν	καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν
Psalm of Solomon 11:3a	**Isaiah 49:12a**
ἀπὸ βορρᾶ ἔρχονται	ἔρχονται ... ἀπὸ βορρᾶ

---

[1] See Pesch, op. cit., pp. 261-262.

[2] Throughout the Solomonic Psalter there is evidence that the psalmist was influenced in his choice of words and in the style of his writing by the book of Isaiah. See O.C. Whitehouse, op. cit., pp. 572-573.

[3] A comparison of the Septuagint text of Isaiah with that of the Masoretic text shows that the former is in close agreement with the latter.

Psalm of Solomon 11:4[1]	Isaiah 40:4
ὄρη ὑψηλὰ ἐταπείνωσεν...	πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς
οἱ βουνοὶ ἐφύγοσαν	ταπεινωθήσεται
Psalm of Solomon 11:7a	**Isaiah 52:1a**
ἔνδυσαι, Ιερουσαλημ	ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν
τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου	σου, Ιερουσαλημ

The verbal agreement in each of these examples is confined to a phrase or two taken from different contexts in the book of Isaiah. This would indicate that the psalmist was familiar with the text of Isaiah and was influenced by its vocabulary and style; but he does not follow extensively any one particular passage. Moreover, in each of these examples, with the exception of Psalm of Solomon 11:3a, the psalmist shares material with Baruch as well, so that the entire passage has material common to Deutero-Isaiah and Baruch; but, there is more extensive agreement with the latter.

On the side of Baruch we note, in addition to the passages above, several verses which seem to restate in another form material found in the book of Isaiah.

Baruch 5:1-3	Isaiah 61:10-11
(1) ἔνδυσαι τὴν εὐπρέπειαν	(10) ἐνέδυσεν... ἱμάτιον

---

[1]The passage in Baruch, in some respects, is closer to the Isaianic material than that in the Psalm.

Baruch 5:7	Isaiah 40:4
...ταπεινοῦσθαι πᾶν ὄρος	πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς
ὑψηλὸν	ταπεινωθήσεται

τῆς ... δόξης

(2) περιβαλοῦ τὴν διπλοΐδα ...
ἐπίθου τὴν μίτραν ἐπὶ
τὴν κεφαλήν

(3) ... θεὸς δείξει τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν
πάσῃ τὴν σὴν λαμπρότητα

σωτηρίου
καὶ χιτῶνα εὐφροσύνης
ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέθηκέν
μοι μίτραν

(11) ... ἀνατελεῖ κύριος
δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα
ἐναντίον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν

Baruch 5:4[1]

Isaiah 62:2

(4) κληθήσεταί γάρ σου
τὸ ὄνομα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα εἰρήνη
δικαιοσύνης καὶ δόξα
θεοσεβείας

(2) καὶ καλέσει σε
τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ καινόν,
ὃ ὁ κύριος ὀνομάσει
αὐτό

The verbal agreement between the material in Baruch and that in Isaiah is very slight.[2] The close affinity in thought, however, would indicate that the passage in Baruch is probably an allusion to the Isaianic material. Both texts depict the future restoration of Jerusalem in a similar way, although the choice of terms is different. But, as already pointed out, insofar as the form and content of Baruch 5 is concerned, there is closer agreement with the eleventh Psalm of Solomon than there is with any passage from the book of

---

[1] Cf. Isa. 1:26b.

[2] We note also that the Septuagint text of Isaiah closely follows the Masoretic text in each of these passages. Closer agreement, then, would not be found between the Greek text of Baruch and the Hebrew text of Isaiah.

Isaiah. Thus, while the psalmist and the author of Baruch 5 probably used the book of Isaiah as a source, the evidence seems to indicate that additional source material was utilized. Either one writer drew from the work of the other or both writers followed a common source.

When one turns to consider the context of the Psalm and that of Baruch some interesting differences appear. The eleventh Psalm of Solomon is a self-contained unit, with a definite structure that may be easily observed.[1] The Psalm falls naturally into three divisions: (1) an introduction, which consists of an address to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (vs. 1);[2] (2) a joyful message directed to Jerusalem, personified as the mother of children dispersed throughout the world (vss. 2-7); and (3) a conclusion in the form of a benediction, expressing the prayer that the Lord will perform for Jerusalem the things he has promised (vss. 8-9). Each section is clearly marked off from the other by a change of address and by differences in form and content.[3] There is no material in Baruch which corresponds to the content and form of the introductory address or the concluding prayer. Only the second part (vss. 2-7) of the Psalm has material par-

---

[1]This has been shown by Pesch (op. cit., p. 256).

[2]A resemblance between Ps. of Sol. 11:1 and Joel 2:1 may be observed in the Greek.

Psalm of Solomon 11:1.	Joel 2:1
Σαλπίσατε ἐν Σιων ἐν σάλπιγγι ... κηρύξατε ἐν ...	Σαλπίσατε σάλπιγγι ἐν Σιων, κηρύξατε ἐν ...

[3]Cf. Pesch, op. cit., pp. 256-257.

allel with that in Baruch.

In the passage in Baruch there are no clearly marked divisions. In contrast to the Psalm we find neither a change of address nor a change in the form of the material.[1] The passage Bar. 5:5-9 forms the last of four strophes in a consoling message directed to Jerusalem (4:30-5:9).[2] Moreover, it has already been observed, in connection with the question of the unity of authorship, that the message of consolation to Jerusalem is intricately related to the series of poems in Bar. 4:5-29;[3] the theme of the return of the exiles (Bar. 5:5-9) is closely bound up with those expressed elsewhere throughout the poems. The children of Jerusalem were led off into captivity because they disobeyed the commandments of God (4:6-16). Jerusalem intercedes for her children and is assured that God will be merciful toward her offspring (4:20 ff.). Judgment is about to come upon the enemy in the form of fire from heaven (4:30-35). The destruction of the enemy provides the occasion of salvation. God will deliver the exiles and will lead them safely home (4:36-37; 5:9). In addition to a continuity of thought throughout the poems in Baruch, there is a similarity in language and style[4] which unites chapter 5 with the pre-

---

[1]This would not be true of the entire series of poems in Bar. 4:5-5:9. Here we note a change in address in 4:9b, 4:17, and 4:30.

[2]Bar. 4:30-5:9 is usually divided as follows: 4:30-35; 4:36-37; 5:1-4; 5:5-9. Cf. above in Chapter I.

[3]See above in Chapter I.

[4]See above in Chapter I.

vious material. It seems less likely, therefore, that the author of Bar. 5:1-9 was dependent upon the eleventh Psalm of Solomon for his material. On this assumption the author of Baruch would have had to rework the material in the Psalm in the following manner: He would remove the introductory address (11:1) and the benediction (11:8-9) as well; rearrange the order of the material so that no two verses follow the same sequence as in the Psalm; and supply additional material based on different passages from Isaiah. At the same time, the message would be constructed in such a way ~~as~~ to correspond with the themes appearing in the previous material in Bar. 4:5 ff. Moreover, the writer would be able to express this message in the language and style of the other poems. While this would not be impossible it seems less likely than. There are fewer difficulties with the view that the psalmist was dependent on the material in Baruch, or that both writers made use of a common source which is no longer extant today.[1] The present writer is inclined to accept the former position. We shall now turn to consider the question of the dating of the materials of the book of Baruch.

---

[1] According to the judgment of Thackeray, the form and contents of the poems in Bar. 4:5-5:9 correspond to that of the cycle of lessons arranged from the book of Isaiah for Jewish liturgical services. This leads Thackeray to conclude that the affinity between Baruch and the Psalm of Solomon is probably due "to mutual dependence on some older document". At the same time, Thackeray is still open to the possibility of Baruch's dependence on the Greek Psalm of Solomon (The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, pp. 106-107).

THE DATING OF THE INDIVIDUAL UNITS

Since the book of Baruch is a composite work, brought together in the course of several stages, consideration should be given first to the composition of the individual parts. We would then be in a better position to suggest a date for the final form of the book. In comparison with the other sections of the book the confessions and prayers in Bar. 1:15 ff. offer us the best evidence from which to suggest a date. This does not mean that the question of dating the material in Bar. 1:15 ff. has been settled; but it would be the most appropriate place to begin.

Confessions and prayers (1:15-3:8). Opinions vary in regard to the date of the composition of the confessions and prayers. Those who attribute this section to Baruch tend to date the material in accordance with the chronological data in 1:2 (usually interpreted to be 583/582 B.C.).[1] The greater number of critics, however, are inclined to date the material at a later time. A few want to date Bar. 1:15-3:8 in the Persian period,[2] but the great majority tend to place this por-

---

[1] See, for example, Kalt, op. cit., pp. 1-5.

[2] According to Ewald the book of Baruch (i.e. Bar. 1:1-3:8) probably was written at a time when dangerous uprisings against the Persian government were in the making. It represents an attempt by the Jews of the Diaspora to discourage the revolutionary nationalists from inciting a rebellion, and to promote good will toward the Persian government. Ewald assigns the material in 1:1-3:8 to the latter phase of the Persian period, namely, 350 B.C. Since he views the material in 1:1-3:8 as a unit, he sees no difficulty in appealing to the statements in the introductory verses (1:10-14).

tion of the book at a time subsequent to the composition of the book of Daniel, the primary reason being the dependency of the former on the latter. But disagreement exists even among those who defend the priority of Daniel against Baruch. O.F. Fritzsche,[1] C.F. Keil,[2] H.St.J. Thackeray,[3] R.R. Harwell,[4] C.C. Torrey,[5] R.H. Pfeiffer,[6] B.N. Wambacq,[7] and others assign this part of the book to a period ranging from the close of the second century B.C. to the first part of the first century A.D. (i.e., before A.D. 70). On the other hand, J.J. Kneucker,[8] E. Schürer,[9] C.H. Cornill,[10] O.C. Whitehouse,[11] W.O.E. Oesterley,[12] and E.J. Goodspeed[13] date this section of the book subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The latter group of

---

to support a date in the Persian era (see Ewald, op. cit., p. 207). Marshall (op. cit., p. 252) and Bissell (op. cit., p. 417) follow Ewald at this point.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 170 ff. [2] Op. cit., pp. 752 ff.

[3] The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, p. 87.

[4] Op. cit., p. 68. [5] Op. cit., p. 63.

[6] Op. cit., p. 416.

[7] Jeremias, Klaagliederen, Baruch, Brief van Jeremias ("De Boeken van Het Oude Testament"; Roermond en Maaseik: J.J. Romen & Zonen-Uitgevers, 1957), p. 359. Hereafter cited as Baruch.

[8] Op. cit., pp. 47-48, 58-61.

[9] History of the Jewish People, div. II, vol. III, p. 192.

[10] Op. cit., pp. 273-274. [11] Op. cit., p. 575.

[12] An Introduction, pp. 263-264.

[13] Op. cit., p. 100.

critics argue that the statements in 1:15-3:8 go back to the experiences and the consequences of the war between the Jews and the Romans in A.D. 66-70: Jerusalem and the entire land of Judah lay in ruins (2:23). As a result of the Roman siege, the supplies of the Jews were cut off, bringing about a scarcity of food. This led to inconceivable horrors -- parents were driven to eat the flesh of their children (2:2-3).[1] The statements in 1:15-3:8, then, presuppose the situation in Jerusalem during the destruction of the city. Consequently, it is argued, an earlier period, such as the time of the Maccabean rebellion (c. 165-145 B.C.) or the time of Pompey's entrance into Jerusalem (63 B.C.), would be unsuitable.

But these objections do not seriously militate against a date in the first century B.C. As was pointed out above in connection with the comparison of Bar. 1:15-2:19 and Dan. 9:5-19, the references to the desolate condition of Jerusalem in the prayer of Daniel are omitted in Baruch. This seems to indicate that neither the city nor the temple was in ruins at the time Bar. 1:15-3:8 was written. Moreover, we are reminded once again that the book of Baruch contains no reference to any specific historical event other than the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. Following the Babylonian con-

---

[1]Josephus, in his description of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, also cites an example of such an incredible act (op. cit., p. 727). But the reference in Baruch can be seen best as an allusion to the traditional description of a city under siege and need not be interpreted as a reference to the crisis of A.D. 70 (cf. Lev. 26:29; Deut. 28:53-57; Jer. 19:9 Lam. 4:10).

quest the Jews would suffer not infrequently at the hands of foreign conquerors, and would wail and lament over their apparent hopeless political situation. Therefore, the statements depicting national suffering should be interpreted in a general way, unless there is corroborating evidence to support a reference to a definite event. In view of these considerations it seems less likely that the material in 1:15-3:8 was written after the crisis of A.D. 70. A date in the first century B.C. or, perhaps, in the early part of the first century A.D. (before A.D. 66-70) would appear more probable.

Introduction (1:3-14). Those who regard 1:1-3:8 as a literary unit would, of course, have no reason to consider the introductory verses apart from the confessions and prayers.[1] But, as we observed earlier in Chapter I, the material in 1:3-14 can be understood best as a later interpolation. The introductory verses, then, would be written at a time subsequent to the composition of the confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8. They were intended to provide the material in 1:15-3:8 with an appropriate setting by giving stress to liturgical matters. Moreover, the statements in 1:10-14, which request the Jews in Jerusalem to pray for the welfare of the king and his son, express a desire to develop friendly relations with the ruling powers. These verses would not be suitable in the years following the destruction of Jerusalem, for the relationship be-

---

[1]See, for example, Ewald, op. cit., p. 207

tween the Jews and the Romans at that time had seriously deteriorated to the point where there was only bitter animosity between the two groups.[1] Therefore, a date some time in the first century B.C. or in the first century A.D. -- i.e., after the composition of 1:15-3:8 but before the war of A.D. 66-70 -- would seem more probable.[2]

The passage on wisdom (3:9-4:4). Various dates have been assigned to the passage on wisdom. Some critics are inclined to date the passage at the same time[3] or shortly after[4] the material in 1:15-3:8 was written. Others would place the passage in a period prior to that of the confessions and prayers[5] or, in the case of a few, at a much later date.[6] The problem of dating the passage is complicated further by the fact that scholars disagree over the dating of the material in

---

[1]It should be noted also that the introductory verses in Baruch are modelled on the letter of Jeremiah to the exiles (see Chapter I). The letter of Jeremiah was written shortly after the first deportation to Babylon, and, therefore, at a time prior to the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. It would seem rather doubtful that the prophet would have offered similar counsel to the Jews after the event of 587 B.C.

[2]So Wambacq, Baruch, p. 360.

[3]E. Sellin seems to imply this. See Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by W. Montgomery (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923), p. 245.

[4]Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, p. 87.

[5]See Harwell, op. cit., pp. 64 ff. and Torrey, op. cit., p. 63.

[6]The Books of the Apocrypha, p. 504. Oesterley dates the passage on wisdom in the year A.D. 150.

1:15-3:8. This provides some explanation for the diversity of scholarly opinion. Moreover, the situation alluded to in the passages on wisdom is interpreted differently. Some critics believe the situation depicted here is essentially the same as that in the confessions and prayers, namely, the dispersion of the Jews, following the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.[1] Others maintain that the passage reflects a time of peace and date the material toward the close of the first century or in the first half of the second century A.D.[2] The passage on wisdom, according to these critics, indicates that a considerable length of time had elapsed since the events of A.D. 70. Those who attempt to date the passage shortly after the crisis of A.D. 70 or in the first half of the second century A.D. appeal to the statements in 3:10-13. But the statements which allude to the exile cannot be used in support of a date, since there is reason to believe they were inserted at a later time, and were designed to adapt the passage to the setting depicted in 1:15-3:8.

It seems more probable, therefore, that the passage on wisdom in its original form (3:9,14-4:4) was written

---

[1]Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 103-104: "An indomitable faith in God characterizes the whole book, and gives it unity, although the three parts may come from different hands. All three reflect the same Jewish disposition, a generation after the fall of the city before the Romans, to adjust themselves to the new conditions, acknowledge the justice of God, believe in Israel's supreme religious heritage, and look forward to the day when their own land would be restored to them." Cf. also Oesterley, An Introduction, pp. 264-265.

[2]Ferrar, op. cit., p. 39.

before the time of the composition of the confessions and prayers. Against a very early date for the passage we note some affinity between Bar. 3:9-4:4 and Job 28 and 38, Deutero-Isaiah 40, and Sirach 24 in respect to the question of the inaccessibility of wisdom, the creative activity of God in connection with his incomparability, and the identification between wisdom and the Torah.[1] In the concluding verses of the passage (4:2-4), an appeal is made to the Jews to remain faithful to the revelation entrusted to them. These verses suggest a time when their loyalty to the Torah was put to the test, i.e., a time prior to the outbreak of the war between the Jews and the Seleucid powers. The passage on wisdom does not seem to have been written in the heat of the conflict; its closing appeal seems to reveal a concern to preserve the traditions of Israel from the syncretistic dangers posed by Hellenism;[2] there was a fear that Israel's unique possession would be surrendered to the pagan world as a result of conforming to or compromising with the Hellenistic modes of life. Hence the appeal was made with a sense of urgency to resist the temptations of an alien culture and adhere faithfully to their own religious traditions.[3] The passage on wisdom, then, was probably written some time in the second century B.C.

---

[1]See Chapters IV, V, and VI below.

[2]Cf. Noth, op. cit., p. 393.

[3]See Chapter VI below.

The poems concerning Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). Scholarly opinion is divided also on the dating of this portion of the book. The statements relating to the desolation of Jerusalem, and the exile and return of the inhabitants are understood by many to reflect the situation in Judaism after the events of A.D. 70.[1] Others argue for a late date on the basis of the dependency of Baruch 5 on the eleventh Psalm of Solomon.[2] A careful examination of the material, however, shows that both arguments are based on uncertain evidence. Concerning the historical situation depicted in Bar. 4:5-5:9 we note the following facts: To a great extent the message is made up of words and phrases drawn from Old Testament texts, and consists of general statements of Jerusalem's distress, and words of consolation regarding her future. From these statements, however, it would be difficult to infer that the city or the temple lay in ruins. The cause of Jerusalem's sorrow is not the destruction of the city or the temple, but the loss of her children. It seems less likely, therefore, that the material in 4:5-5:9 was written after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, since there is no mention of the desolate condition of the city or the temple. Moreover, the reason for Jerusalem to rejoice is found in the hope of the return of her children from the land of the enemy. It is not unreasonable to expect in the consoling messages to Jerusalem some references to the

---

[1] Cf. Kneucker, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

[2] Cf. Bentzen, op. cit., p. 232.

future rebuilding of the city. But the statements depicting the glorification of Jerusalem seem to center chiefly around the return of her inhabitants without any clear allusion to the repairing of the walls or the temple.

A comparison of Baruch 5 with Psalm of Solomon 11, moreover, does not convince one that the former was dependent on the latter. The possibility remains, however, that the Psalm was modelled on the passage in Baruch. Thus, while we have no definite clues for dating the material in Bar. 4:5-5:9 it seems reasonable to assign this portion of the book to the first century B.C., although an earlier date would be possible. Evidence against a very early date can be found in the verbal affinities which Bar. 4:5-5:9 may be seen to share with some of the late passages in the book of Isaiah.

THE DATING OF THE FINAL FORM OF THE BOOK

On the basis of internal evidence the following conclusions were formulated: (1) The earliest portions of the book of Baruch consist of the passage on wisdom (3:9-4:4) and the material centering around the desolation and glorification of Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). In all probability both parts of the book originated some time in the second or first century B.C. (2) The confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8 were probably edited at a time subsequent to the composition of the prayer in Daniel but before the Jewish-Roman conflict in A.D. 66-70; this would allow a time ranging from 150 B.C. to A.D. 50, a period of two

hundred years.[1] It would be difficult to be more precise than this. (3) The introductory verses 1:3-14 were probably written after the material in 1:15-3:8 but before the outbreak of the Jewish-Roman wars. A probable date would be in the early part of the first century A.D. Because the evidence available is uncertain these conclusions at best can only be tentative; but they seem to be the more probable in view of the arguments advanced above.

In addition to the evidence drawn from the contents of the book consideration should be given to the external evidence available. Some scholars who argue for a Hebrew original have used such arguments to support an early date for the book of Baruch. If the book of Baruch existed originally in Hebrew, then, it must have preceded the event of A.D. 70, for within two generations from the event the native church of Irenaeus in Asia Minor, as well as that of Clement of Alexandria, considered the Greek text of Baruch as part of the book of Jeremiah.[2] While the evidence is less certain for 3:9-5:9, there is a strong indication that the confessions and prayers in 1:15-3:8 were originally composed in Hebrew.[3] Some time would have had to elapse between the composition of 1:15-3:8

---

[1]The tendency today is to date the book of Daniel in the second century B.C. (ca. 167-163 B.C.). This is not to deny the fact that the author is utilizing older material. Form-critical studies have shown that the material contained in a given document is oftentimes considerably older than the document itself (cf. Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 522-528).

[2]Cf. Harwell, op. cit., pp. 64-65.

[3]See above in Chapter I.

in Hebrew and its subsequent translation into Greek. If the remaining portions of the book were written in Greek -- a point which can be contested -- they were probably added to the prayers and confessions after the latter had been translated and not prior to that time. Although not impossible, it seems less probable that the book of Baruch at one time consisted of material partly in Hebrew and partly in Greek. Instead, it seems that the translator of Bar. 1:15-3:8 may also have been the one who added the other materials which were already in circulation.

Returning to the question of the use of the book of Baruch by the Church Fathers, we note the following facts: A number of Church Fathers, namely, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, Hilary of Poitiers, Basil of Caesarea, Ambrose, John Cassian, and Augustine quote passages from the book of Baruch but attribute them to the prophet Jeremiah.[1] Theodoret refers to the book as the "prophecy of Jeremiah".[2] Oftentimes a passage from Baruch is introduced by the formula, "the prophet says" -- a reference probably to Jeremiah, since the same individuals attribute other passages to him.[3] Cyprian quotes a passage from Baruch with the words "in Jeremiah", while John Chrysostom, somewhat like Cyprian, introduces a quotation with the formula, "And Baruch in the book of Jeremiah

---

[1]For a thorough list of the Patristic quotations from the book of Baruch see Reusch, op. cit., pp. 1-22.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

says...."[1] The book of Baruch was also cited as Holy Scripture, the Divine Utterances, Divine Scripture, or simply Scripture.[2] This, of course, was due to the fact that the Fathers were following a canonical tradition which is believed to have had its roots in Alexandria, and which differed from the Palestinian tradition.

We are in no position to treat the question of the canon, but some observations may shed light on the problem under consideration. Prior to the Council of Jamnia in A.D. 90 there is little knowledge from which to draw conclusions regarding the attitude of the Jews toward the book of Baruch. There seems to have been a difference of opinion among the Jews as to what constituted sacred literature. At the same time, there is reason to believe that the idea of a definitely fixed canon of Scripture did not come to the fore until the close of the first century A.D.[3] Yet, even after the decision of the rabbis to limit the Scriptures to the Masoretic canon of thirty-nine books, the Christian church could continue for centuries with no clearly defined canon of sacred literature. Moreover, the Christian church, especially in Greek-speaking circles, was inclined to follow the Alexandrian tradition whereas the Syrian Christians tended to follow the tradition endorsed by the

---

[1] Reusch, op. cit., pp. 1-22.

[2] Ibid.

[3] See Paul Feine, Johannes Behm and Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, translated by A.J. Mattill, Jr. (fourteenth revised edition; Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 335 f.

Council of Jamnia.[1] Nevertheless, even among the Greek Fathers dissenting voices were heard against many of the writings not found in the Hebrew canon.[2] Lists of the Holy Scriptures appear which contain only the books of the Old Testament approved of by the Council of Jamnia. But what is most interesting is the fact that in some of the lists which exclude a number of the books of the Septuagint (treating them as non-canonical) we find the book of Baruch.[3] This, undoubtedly, was due to the fact that from earliest times the book of Baruch was closely associated with the book of Jeremiah and, consequently, would not be considered an independent work.

In connection with the question of the relationship between the book of Baruch and the book of Jeremiah R.R. Harwell has made some interesting observations. In the manuscripts of the Old Latin version, designated Old Latin b, the book of Baruch begins with Jer. 52:12, and, therefore, may be seen to represent a Greek text which differed from the standard Greek text of Jeremiah preserved in the Septuagint today, as well as the Hebrew text transmitted by the Masoretes. The manuscripts designated Old Latin a are based on a Greek text which came into being after the book of Baruch had been separated from the book of Jeremiah.[4]

---

[1]Cf. Frants Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, translated by John MacPherson, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), pp. 52-54.

[2]Ibid., pp. 55 ff.

[3]Cf. Marshall, op. cit., p. 254.

[4]Harwell, op. cit., pp. 41-43.

A close relationship between the Greek text of Baruch and the Greek text of Jeremiah was claimed earlier by H.St.J. Thackeray. Thackeray has shown that a close affinity exists between the language and style of the Greek in Bar. 1:1-3:8 and that of the second half of the book of Jeremiah.[1] This close affinity can be interpreted, on the one hand, as the result of an imitation of the language and style of Jeremiah 29-51 on the part of the translator of Bar. 1:1-3:8. Or, on the other hand, it can mean that the translator of the second half of Jeremiah was also the individual who translated the text of Baruch.[2] In view of the fact that the Septuagint text of Jeremiah was probably translated by two different individuals, and that the affinity in language and style between Baruch and Jeremiah was confined, to a great extent, to the second half of Jeremiah, the second position seems to be more plausible. The importance of the connection between the Greek of Baruch and that of Jeremiah is to be found in the fact that a lengthy quotation from the latter appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and therefore indicates an early date for the Greek text of Baruch.[3]

---

[1]Cf. "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", pp. 245-266, and 578-585.

[2]So R.R. Harwell, op. cit., p. 68.

[3]Cf. the statement of Thackeray: "A certain terminus ad quem is afforded by the long quotation from Jer. xxxviii 31 ff. in the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii 8 ff.). The writer of the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (about 132 B.C.) makes an indirect allusion to the existence of a translation of the 'prophecies' in his day, but we are left in doubt as to the extent of the collection. The second half of Jeremiah may have been just rendered when the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus was written: at

In the final analysis it must be admitted, however, that the external evidence for dating the book of Baruch is inconclusive. In realization of the limitations imposed upon us by the nature of the evidence one cannot assume that the question of the date of the book of Baruch can be settled with much certainty. Instead, one can only suggest a date which at best can be only tentative. In view of what has been said above, the weight of the evidence would seem to fall in favor of a date in the early part of the first century A.D.[1]

Conclusion. The absence of definite clues makes it difficult for one to arrive at a specific date with any degree of certainty for any portion of the book. The historical background depicted is the Babylonian exile, but few critics would date the book or any portion of the book in that period. The question which has divided scholarship for some time centers around the interpretation of the statements which allude to the

---

any rate it was probably completed and attached to the other portion not very long after that date." ("The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", p. 265).

[1]G. Fohrer assigns the following dates to several works attributed to Baruch: (1) The book of Baruch found in the Apocrypha (the one which we are concerned with) -- 1st century B.C.; (2) The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch -- A.D. 100-130; (3) The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch -- A.D. 130; cf. "Baruch", Calwer Bibellexikon (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959), p. 127. Cf. also the statement of A. van der Born: "Some Catholic exegetes think that it [the book of Baruch] should not be dated more recently than 300 B.C. But according to the common opinion its composition is probably not earlier than the first century B.C." ("Baruch", Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible, translated and adapted by Louis F. Hartman, et al. [second revised edition; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963], col. 211).

disaster of 587 B.C. Are we to understand these statements as reflections of the actual conditions in Judaism resulting from a national disaster similar to that of 587 B.C.? Or are these statements to be seen as reminiscenes of that event? The second interpretation would seem more probable since the book deals with generalities and contains no specific allusions to any contemporary historical event. Moreover, throughout the entire book we note the application of a certain literary method, namely, the use of words and phrases drawn from Old Testament scripture to formulate one's own message. These facts seem to make less probable the view that the book is a description of the actual conditions in Judaism. A national calamity would not be the motivating factor behind the composition of the individual parts nor the compilation of the book as a whole. Instead, the book reflects the general hope of the Jews in the future glorification of Jerusalem and the return of all her children. In view of these facts a date in the first half of the first century A.D. would seem to be the probable time of the compilation of the book of Baruch in its final form.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING THE WISDOM PASSAGE IN BARUCH

The purpose of this chapter will be to provide a general background for an understanding of the passage on wisdom in Baruch. Some attention will be focused on the wisdom vocabulary[1] in Bar. 3:9-4:4, as well as the concept of wisdom in general.

WISDOM VOCABULARY IN BARUCH 3:9-4:4

Σοφία[2] The term σοφία may be defined simply as "wisdom",[3] but the word has other shades of meaning which vary

---

[1]By the expression 'wisdom vocabulary' reference is made to those terms in Bar. 3:9-4:4 which are frequently found in the Wisdom Literature or in passages associated with wisdom: σοφία, φρόνησις, σύνεσις and ἐπιστήμη.

[2]In the Septuagint σοφία has been used to translate a number of Hebrew terms: חָכְמָה "wisdom" (Prov. 1:20); "skill" (Ex. 35:31); "shrewdness" (II Sam. 20:22), etc.; תְּבוּנָה "understanding" (Deut. 4:6; Isa. 29:14, etc.) and שֵׂכֶל "insight", "understanding" (I Chron. 22:12). The information concerning the Hebrew equivalents of the Greek words was taken from Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897); insofar as the actual meanings of the Hebrew words are concerned, Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (eds.), Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953), and BDB were used.

[3]Cf. Walter Bauer, op. cit., p. 766.

according to their context. In Ex. 35:31,35; 36:1,2 etc., σοφία, as a translation of the Hebrew term חָכְמָה, has the meaning of "ability" or of "skill" as a craftsman. It is interesting to note in this particular passage that such wisdom or ability is conceived as a charismatic gift; it is bestowed on the individual along with the spirit (רוּחַ)[1] of God. Craftsmen were considered wise men because they were proficient in a particular field; they acquired great knowledge and experience in their trade and established for themselves a respectable reputation. The craftsmen, who were involved with the manufacturing of idols, however, come under the attacks of the prophets and are denounced as "stupid and foolish".[2] Σοφία has also the meaning of "sound judgment", of "intelligence", of "prudence", as well as of "practical" and "political wisdom";[3] it enables kings to reign, rulers to make just decrees, and princes and governors to rule and govern their people well.[4] Σοφία is what the sage offers the student; when followed it leads to life, wealth, honor, peace and happiness.[5] This term has been used,

---

[1]See Chapter IV where reference is made to the wisdom of Joseph, Solomon and Daniel.

[2]See Jer. 10:8. This verse along with verses 6-7,10 and part of verse 16 is not found in the Septuagint text; it has been argued that these verses did not belong to the original composition of the book of Jeremiah. Cf. James Philip Hyatt, Introduction to and Exegesis of the Book of Jeremiah, IB (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), V, 897.

[3]Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (eighth edition, revised; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 1409.

[4]Cf. Prov. 8:15,16.

[5]Cf. Prov. 3:1-2, 13-18.

on the one hand, to mean a knowledge of natural science[1] and, on the other hand, "the secret of the created order".[2] At times σοφία is personified as an individual who speaks with authority exceeding that of the prophet;[3] she holds in her hand the ultimate issues of life and death; with her are truth and righteousness.[4] In this brief survey we cannot do justice to the wealth of meaning associated with the term, but can only offer a general picture of the different ways in which the term has been used. In Baruch the term σοφία occurs twice -- once in the expression "the fountain of wisdom" (3:12) and again in the phrase "the way of wisdom" (3:23). In the first passage wisdom is closely associated with the Torah, or the commandments of God whereas in the second passage the term seems to mean the principle of order established in the universe.[5]

Φρόνησις.[6] The basic meaning of φρόνησις is that of

---

[1]Liddell and Scott, loc. cit.; cf. I Kgs. 4:33 (LXX, III Kgs. 5:13).

[2]See Chapter V.

[3]Wisdom appeals to no authority other than herself. Cf. Theodore H. Robinson's statement: "She is personified as a teacher in several places, but her position is, in fact, much higher than this. She appears as a divine quality, and indeed, as something more than a quality. She is the actual agent of creation" (The Poetry of the Old Testament [London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1960], p. 171).

[4]Prov. 8:7-8.

[5]See Chapters V and VI.

[6]In the Septuagint φρόνησις is used to translate תְּבוּנָה "understanding" (Prov. 3:13), בִּינָה "discernment (Prov. 1:2), דַּעַת "knowledge" (Prov. 24:5), חָכְמָה "wisdom" (I Kgs. 3:28), לֵב "mind" (Prov. 19:8), etc.

"mind", of "purpose", or of "intention".[1] But the word can also denote "understanding", "insight", or "intelligence". Before the Pharaoh of Egypt Joseph appears as the ideal man to administer Egyptian affairs because of his φρόνησις.[2] Solomon, similarly, is seen as a man of insight and understanding when he presides over a case involving a dispute between two ladies.[3] In Prov. 3:19 the term φρόνησις is found parallel with σοφία in reference to God's creative activity: God founded the earth by σοφία and prepared the heavens by φρόνησις.[4] One can see, then, some common ground between the two terms insofar as their usage is concerned. In Baruch the term φρόνησις occurs three times (3:9,14,29) with a meaning synonymous to that of σοφία in 2:23.

Σύνεσις.[5] The term σύνεσις appears four times in Baruch -- once in 3:14, twice in 3:23 and once in 3:32. In the first reference it is seen to offer, along with φρόνησις, strength, longevity and life. In the passage 3:23 it occurs in connection with people who are in search of wisdom and understanding. The passage 3:32 refers to God's discovery of wisdom;

---

[1] Liddell and Scott, op. cit., p. 1694.

[2] Gen. 41:39 ff. See also Chapter IV.

[3] Cf. I Kgs. 3:16-28.

[4] See Chapter V.

[5] In the Septuagint σύνεσις translates a number of Hebrew terms, some of which are: שֵׂכֶל "prudence", "good sense" (I Sam. 25:3); דַּעַת "knowledge: (Job 15:2); בִּינָה "understanding" (Job 20:3; 28:20); טַעַם "judgment", "discretion", "discernment" (Job 12:20).

by his σύνεσις God searched out the way of knowledge. The word σύνεσις has been defined as "the faculty of comprehension", "intelligence", "acuteness" or " shrewdness", and we may include "insight" and "understanding".[1] It has the meaning of "conscience" as well, and in this sense may be seen to correspond closely to συνείδησις.[2] But the meaning of "insight" or "understanding" seems to fit best the examples in Baruch. This would mean that in Baruch the meaning is closest to the Hebrew term בִּינָה.[3]

ἐπιστήμη.[4] This word means "knowledge" or "understanding", in the sense of being acquainted with something or to know or understand how to do something, i.e., to possess a certain skill, or to have experience.[5] The term occurs in Ex. 31: 3 along with σοφία and σύνεσις as part of the charismatic endowment bestowed on the craftsmen Bezalel and Oholiah. But the term is not confined to this meaning. ἐπιστήμη can mean knowledge in the sense of total understanding, as distinguished from a special area, or a specific skill.[6] This more general

---

[1]Bauer, op. cit., p. 796.

[2]Liddell and Scott, op. cit., p. 1489.

[3]Some correspondence may be seen between Baruch 3 and Job 28, insofar as the use of the term σύνεσις is concerned.

[4]ἐπιστήμη is used in the Septuagint as a translation of בִּינָה "understanding" (Job 28:12); דֵּעַ "knowledge", "opinion" (Job 32:6); and שֵׂכֶל "understanding" (i.e. the meaning).

[5]Liddell and Scott, op. cit., p. 555; cf. also Bauer, op. cit., p. 300.

[6]Cf. Job 28:12.

meaning seems to be the sense in which the term ἐπιστήμη is used in Baruch.

The wisdom vocabulary in Bar. 3:9-4:4 then, consists of the terms σοφία, φρόνησις, σύνεσις and ἐπιστήμη, all of which appear to be synonymous in meaning. Each word seems to be used to indicate "wisdom", "knowledge", or "understanding" in the broad sense of the term.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND THEOLOGICAL WISDOM[1]

Anthropological wisdom. By the expression "anthropological wisdom" we mean the wisdom-teaching which had man at the center,[2] i.e., the primary concern of this wisdom-teaching was focused on man's activity in the world of human affairs rather than on God's activity in creating and maintaining the world. The expression "human wisdom"[3] or "worldly wisdom"[4]

---

[1]Cf. Hans Heinrich Schmid, Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: Eine Untersuchung zur altorientalischen und israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966), pp. 144 ff. and 155 ff. The author uses the expressions "Die Theologisierung der Weisheit" ("the theologizing of wisdom") and "Die Anthropologisierung der Weisheit" ("the anthropologizing of wisdom") to refer to two different tendencies or processes within the wisdom-movement. The former centered around God's activity whereas the latter was concerned with human experience.

[2]Cf. H.H. Schmid, op. cit., p. 156.

[3]Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, translated by D.M.G. Stalker (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962), I, 441.

[4]H.H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 137.

would also be applicable in this respect. But we do not mean to imply by this that anthropological wisdom was purely secular in its orientation, i.e., non-religious. The general outlook of the Israelite sage was essentially religious in that the reality and presence of God was more or less assumed,[1] although not particularly stressed at any time.[2] At times the thought of God seems quite remote, but it would be erroneous to conclude that the sage had no place for God in his teaching. On the contrary one may be able to say that the supreme and righteous rule of God was presupposed in the teachings of the sage.[3]

An example of anthropological wisdom can be found in the maxims of Proverbs 10-29. Here we find proverbs on life and behavior as observed by the sage on matters pertaining to riches and poverty,[4] industry and laziness,[5] wisdom and folly,[6] humility and pride,[7] righteousness and wickedness,[8] etc. The teaching contained in these maxims is derived from the realm of human experience where the sage has observed certain "laws" in

---

[1]Even in Ecclesiastes where one is confronted by an "utterly secular form" of thinking there is a searching for God; cf. von Rad, op. cit., p. 455.

[2]Cf. Prov. 15:3: The eyes of Yahweh are everywhere; he observes both evil and good.

[3]Cf. T.H. Robinson, op. cit., p. 174.

[4]Cf. Prov. 10:4,15.

[5]Cf. Prov. 10:4; 12:11.

[6]Cf. Prov. 12:15; 14:29; 15:14,21; 16:22.

[7]Cf. Prov. 11:2; 16:19; cf. 15:33 and 16:18; 18:12.

[8]Cf. Prov. 14:34; 15:9.

operation: the diligent individual is rewarded for his efforts whereas the lazy man has only shame and misery;[1] the righteous enjoy prosperity but the wicked suffer misfortune;[2] the man who is prudent seeks knowledge, but the fool scorns at instruction.[3] This wisdom-teaching is of a practical nature, allowing little room, if any, for speculative thinking;[4] it is concerned with matters pertaining to every day living, and is designed to show one how to live successfully. Virtues are praised and vices are condemned in no uncertain terms. The prudent man is one who will give heed to the teachings of the sage, for such teachings will provide him with a safeguard against the dangers and pitfalls of life.[5]

---

[1]Cf. Prov. 12:24,27; 13:4; 15:19; 19:24; 20:4; 21:4.

[2]Cf. Prov. 12:3,7; 13:21; 14:32.

[3]Cf. Prov. 17:24; 18:15; 23:9.

[4]"Unlike the Greeks, the Hebrews were not a speculative people. Abstract ideas have little place in their speech, for they were a fundamentally practical people. In so far as they did indulge in speculation, it was less on the ultimate nature of reality than on the nature of wisdom, less on the nature of God's Being than on the forms of His self-manifestation, less on the ultimate destiny of man than on the nature of the good life" (Rowley, loc. cit.)

[5]"But 'the wise' took into account the individual's peace, welfare and happiness in the family and in the community. They study particularly all the great human motives of conduct -- gratitude, friendship, love, hate, wealth, reputation. Wisdom is the ability to assess truly the values of life" (O.S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936], p.4).

Theological wisdom. The expression "theological wisdom" is used here to mean the wisdom conceived as divine revelation, or as "the mediator of revelation",[1] in distinction from the wisdom derived from human experience. The tendency to speak of wisdom in terms of divine revelation can be observed already in Proverbs 1-9.[2] This can be seen particularly in connection with the personification of wisdom in Proverbs 8:[3] Wisdom makes her appeal before all, on the streets, and beside the gates of the town. With a sense of urgency peculiar to this section of Proverbs she exhorts men to seek her counsel and instruction. In her hands are found the ultimate issues of life and death. From her mouth is uttered truth unmixed with error. All who seek her will be guided safely along the straight path leading to life; those who avoid or forsake her will meet with death.[4] In the Wisdom Literature of later Judaism we find wisdom fully equated with divine revelation in the identification between wisdom and Torah. Wisdom is now conceived as the divine teaching entrusted to Israel in the Mosaic legislation.[5]

Theological wisdom also includes an interest in God's

---

[1]Cf. von Rad, op. cit., p. 441.

[2]It is difficult to determine specific dates for the various concepts of wisdom. But, there seems to be some basis for assigning theological wisdom to the period following the exile. Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946], p. 6 ff).

[3]See Chapter V of the dissertation.

[4]Cf. Prov. 8:7-8; 34-36.

[5]See Chapter VI of the dissertation.

activity as Creator and Sustainer of the world.[1] Wisdom appears alongside God's power as a divine attribute through which God creates and manages the universe. Wisdom is conceived also as an independent entity alongside God in the cosmos; she is discovered by God and becomes the means through which the universe is created and regulated.[2]

The tendency to speak of wisdom as the property or possession of God has led, at times, to the conclusion that wisdom is inaccessible to man. Such is the viewpoint of Job 28, and, as will be observed in Chapter IV of this study, the position taken by the author of Bar. 3:9-4:4. In the wisdom passage in Baruch emphasis is given to the fact that man, in spite of his determined striving after knowledge, has not discovered the way to wisdom; wisdom is not at man's disposal, but remains beyond his reach. We also note in Baruch an interest in God's creative activity as seen in connection with his discovery of wisdom. The third significant feature of the wisdom passage in Baruch is the identification made between wisdom and the Torah;[3] the wisdom which is inaccessible to man was completely searched out by God and entrusted to Israel as her exclusive possession; this wisdom is the Torah which endures throughout the ages.

In respect to these three points -- the inaccessibility of wisdom, wisdom as God's attribute in his creating and regu-

---

[1]Cf. Prov. 3:19; 8:22-31, as well as Job 28,37,38,39.

[2]Cf. Job 28:23-27.

[3]Bar. 4:1; cf. Chapter VI of the dissertation.

lating the universe, and the identification between wisdom and the Torah -- the wisdom passage in Baruch may be classified as theological wisdom. By means of these three points or topics an examination of the theological background of Bar. 3:9-4:4 will follow in Chapters IV, V, and VI of the dissertation.

CHAPTER IV

THE INACCESSIBILITY OF WISDOM

An examination of the theological background of the wisdom passage in Baruch may be facilitated by a division of the passage into three parts, namely, (1) The Inaccessibility of Wisdom (3:15-31); (2) Wisdom and Creation (3:32-38); and (3) Wisdom and Torah (3:9-14;4:1-4). One of the principal features of the wisdom passage in Baruch is the author's identification of wisdom with the Torah given to Israel -- a feature by no means peculiar to Baruch[1] but, nevertheless, one of the main points of emphasis in the passage. The significance of this identification, however, can be fully appreciated only after one has considered the question of the inaccessibility of wisdom, and that of wisdom in connection with creation. The question of the inaccessibility of wisdom is introduced in verse 15 after a brief address to Israel (3:9-14); the latter material, as we shall attempt to show later in the study, can be treated best in the context of the concluding verses of the wisdom passage (4:1-4). The method that will be followed throughout this section of the dissertation will be to outline briefly the material in Baruch and then consider the general background of the material.

---

[1]See, for example, Sir. 24:23 ff.

THE QUESTION OF THE INACCESSIBILITY OF WISDOM IN BARUCH

The thesis that wisdom is inaccessible to man is introduced by the rhetorical question, "Who has found her place?" (3:15). The author proceeds to answer the question by calling attention to various classes of people from the nations surrounding Israel, who have moved about on the face of the earth but have failed to discover wisdom. The rulers of nations -- those whom one would expect to be skilled in the science of government -- have not found the path of knowledge (vs. 16). Men have lorded over the beasts of the earth and have made sport with the birds of the heavens, but they have failed to find wisdom (vss. 16-17). Some have been successful in securing large sums of silver and gold; but none of these have acquired wisdom. The folly of their ways is seen in the fact that they put their trust in material possessions. There was no limit to their quest for riches, nor to the anxiety accompanying the search; but they have vanished from the scene of their labor, and others have arisen in their place (vss. 17-19).

Later generations appeared on the earth, but they too proved incapable of grasping a knowledge of the way to wisdom (vs. 20); their descendants wandered about far from her paths (vs. 21). The Canaanites, the people from Teman,[1] and the

---

[1]Probably a reference to the Edomites. See below.

Ishmaelites[1] do not have wisdom. The merchants,[2] the legend tellers, and those whose primary objective in life was to seek wisdom have no knowledge of her dwelling place (vss. 22-23). The giants, who lived in primeval times, and who achieved a measure of fame for their stature and their skill in warfare, likewise perished without wisdom. At this point the author makes an interesting comment: the giants failed to find wisdom because God did not choose them nor show them the way (vss. 24:28). Here we note a connection between the possession of wisdom and the idea of election. The author seems to be tipping his hand, so to speak, to inform the reader in advance, of a point which he wishes to emphasize, namely, that the way to wisdom has been shown only to Israel, God's elect people (vs. 37). The connection between the gift of wisdom and the election of Israel is a question which will be treated a little later in the study.[3]

Wisdom dwells in a place inaccessible to man. No one has ascended to heaven to bring wisdom down from the clouds (vs. 29). Man, therefore, is neither able to discern the way to wisdom nor capable of securing her. Furthermore, wisdom is an object of incomparable value; one cannot exchange the finest gold for her.

---

[1]The text reads: "the sons of Hagar".

[2]The text reads: "The merchants of Merran and Teman". Critics have been unable to identify Merran. Some believe the term Merran is the result of a misreading of the original Hebrew text and suggest that the passage originally contained a reference to the Midianite merchants. See above.

[3]This will be discussed in Chapters V and VI.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE MATERIAL IN BARUCH

The background of the material in Baruch will be discussed under three sub-headings: (1) Wisdom and the non-Israelites; (2) Wisdom and wealth; and (3) Wisdom's dwelling place.

Wisdom and the non-Israelites. According to the author of the wisdom passage in Baruch, the peoples surrounding Israel (the Canaanites, Edomites, Ishmaelites, etc.), as well as the nations in general, have not discovered wisdom. Such an assertion, however, finds little support in the Old Testament. On the contrary, the idea of wisdom among foreign peoples is assumed in a number of passages.[1] Among the ancient Israelites it was generally recognized that wisdom belonged to the peoples surrounding Israel, as well as to Israel herself. For example, we find references to the wise men of Egypt (Gen. 41:8; Ex. 7:11; etc.), of the Near East in general (I Kgs. 4:30), of Persia (Esth. 1:13; 6:13), and of Babylon (Dan. 2:12 ff.). In the book of Job the Edomites,[2] and perhaps, the people of Arabia[3] in general, are represented as having extraordinary wisdom.

---

[1]See J. Lindblom, "Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East, edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum" III; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955), pp. 192-204. Hereafter this volume will be cited as SVT.

[2]Cf. Job 2:11.

[3]The friends of Job are said to come from Northwest Arabia. See Job 2:11.

Proverbs 30 and 31[1] contain fragments of foreign wisdom,[2] as well. Wisdom among the non-Israelite peoples is generally recognized by the prophets also.[3] In view of these facts, the thesis advanced by the author of the wisdom passage in Baruch seems to stand in sheer contradition to the general witness of the Old Testament. At the same time, however, we note in a number of Old Testament passages a tendency to emphasize the superiority of the wisdom of Israel over against that possessed by her neighbors. Three examples will be sufficient to illustrate this tendency: (1) the wisdom of Joseph, (2) the wisdom of Solomon, and (3) the wisdom of Daniel and his companions. In an article entitled "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom", von Rad[4] attempts to show how the narrative about Joseph is more closely linked with the earlier wisdom writings than with the patriarchal traditions.[5] Joseph appears as the ideal administrator. His advancement to such a noble position is seen as the result of his qualities of "outspokenness and good counsel".[6] He knows how and when to speak; at the decisive moment

---

[1]Prov. 30:1 ff. is ascribed to Agur the son of Jakeh of Massa; portions of Proverbs 31 supposedly came from King Lemuel, a non-Israelite. See Lindblom, op. cit., p. 192.

[2]Cf. also the relationship between Prov. 22:17-24:22and "The Instruction of Amen-em-ope", a product of Egyptian wisdom.

[3]See above.

[4]The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 292-300.

[5]Ibid., pp. 292-293.

[6]Cf. Prov. 22:29. Cf. also Gerhard von Rad, Genesis, translated by John H. Marks ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 371 f.

he offers sound advice and is rewarded.[1] Other affinities between the Joseph Narrative and the early wisdom writings are to be found in Joseph's discreet behavior when approached by Potiphar's wife,[2] and his prudence and patience in dealing with his own brothers.[3] Our concern, however, is to note how Joseph measures up to the wise men of Egypt when he is put to the test. Before Joseph is summoned to appear before Pharaoh, the Egyptian magicians and wise men are called in. But they are not able to interpret the dream (Gen. 41:8). Joseph then appears before Pharaoh, interprets the dream, and offers good counsel. During the years when Egypt will have a surplus of food the government is to take advantage of the situation by building storehouses to preserve the grain for the years of drought which were to follow. Pharaoh, therefore, should appoint an administrator who is "discreet" and "wise" in order that this program might be carried out successfully (Gen. 41:33-36). The proposal meets with Pharaoh's approval. The admission of Pharaoh follows next: "Since God has shown you all this, there is no one as intelligent and as wise as you" (Gen. 41:39). It would not be entirely fair to say that the writer is seeking to depreciate in the minds of his readers the wisdom of Egypt. Still the wise men of Egypt do not compare favorably with Joseph. The significance of Pharaoh's admission of Joseph's superior wisdom stands out

---

[1]Gen. 41:41 ff.; cf. Prov. 24:13-14.

[2]Cf. the wisdom-teaching on the subject of immoral women (Prov. 5:1-23; 7:6-27; 23:27-28).

[3]Cf. Prov. 14:29.

all the more in view of his earlier statements concerning his own advisers.[1]

The connection between Solomon and wisdom appears in a number of places in the Old Testament,[2] as well as in the literature of later Judaism.[3] The passage which interests us is found in I Kgs. 5:9-14:[4]

> And God gave Solomon wisdom, and understanding beyond measure, and greatness of mind like the sand on the shore of the sea; so that the wisdom of Solomon was greater than the wisdom of all the children of the East and all the wisdom of Egypt. He was wiser than Ethan, the Ezrahite, and Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; moreover, his name was in all the surrounding nations. He spoke three thousand proverbs and his songs were a thousand and five. He spoke about trees, from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of the wall. He spoke also of beasts, and birds, and reptiles and fish. And men came from all peoples to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and from all the kings of the earth, who heard of his wisdom.

The passage is self-explanatory and, therefore, needs little comment. There was no one in the Near East as wise as Solomon; he was incomparable in wisdom.[5]

---

[1] Cf. Gen. 41:8,15,24 where it is repeatedly stated that the wise men of Egypt were not able to explain the meaning of the dream to Pharoah.

[2] Cf. N.W. Porteous, "Royal Wisdom", SVT, III (1955), 247-261.

[3] For example, The Wisdom of Solomon.

[4] The antiquity and reliability of this passage has been questioned recently by R.B.Y. Scott in an article entitled, "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel" (SVT, III [1955], 262-279). But the conclusions arrived at, if correct, do not affect our study, since we are concerned only with the tendency to stress the superiority of Israelite wisdom. Whether the tradition is factual or legendary, then, is beside the point.

[5] Cf. I Kgs. 3:12. No one before or after Solomon would be equal to him in wisdom.

The stories in the first part of the book of Daniel (chapters 1-6) are of interest to us because of the way Daniel and his friends advance in the court of a foreign king. There are some affinities between these stories and the Joseph narrative.[1] Daniel possesses qualities similar to those of Joseph. In a time of crisis he proves capable of meeting the situation. He knows how to conduct himself in the presence of the king and offers sound counsel, when given the opportunity.[2] The indebtedness of the book of Daniel to the Wisdom Literature has been recognized by a number of scholars for some time.[3] There is reason to believe that some of the stories in the first half of the book had their origin in wisdom circles,[4] but we do not wish to concern ourselves with these questions. Our aim instead is to focus attention on the passages which stress, or point out with some emphasis, the superiority of Israel's wisdom. In the opening chapter of the book of Daniel the sup-

---

[1] Cf. N.W. Porteous, Daniel, p. 19.

[2] Dan. 4:27; cf. Prov. 14:34; also 3:1-2.

[3] Porteous, Daniel, pp. 15 ff.

[4] Cf. the statement of E.W. Heaton: "It is evident that by the time of Ben Sira (c. 180 B.C.), the sages had become the students, guardians and teachers of the whole Jewish tradition and all Hebrew literature was now by adoption and interpretation the wisdom of the scribe" (taken from Porteous, Daniel, p. 17); cf. also the statement of Porteous (p. 43): "It may be granted that the author of Daniel, like every educated Hebrew, must have been steeped in the thought of the Wisdom books, since no doubt the wise men as a class had much to do with what education was given to the young."

eriority of the wisdom of the Hebrews is set forth. The first chapter, in this respect, serves as an appropriate introduction to the book, especially to chapters 2-6. As a result of their loyalty to the dietary laws of Judaism, Daniel and his friends were endowed with extraordinary intellectual gifts, which placed them in a class all by themselves; this was especially true of Daniel, who was blessed with the gift of interpreting riddles and dreams.[1] At the end of a three-year period Daniel and his friends surpassed all others in wisdom and understanding:

> God gave them knowledge and prudence in all letters, and wisdom; and Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams.... And in every matter of wisdom and knowledge concerning which the king inquired of them, he found them ten times greater than all of the magicians and enchanters that were in all of his kingdom (1:17,20).

In the second chapter of Daniel we find an illustration of the superior wisdom of the Jewish youth. As in the case with Joseph in the court of Egypt, Daniel is introduced to the king only after the wise men of Babylon have given evidence of their inability to meet the king's demands.[2] In this time of crisis Daniel appears as the ideal sage. He discusses the problem with the captain of the king's guard, and, because of his "prudence" and "discretion", secures permission to appear be-

---

[1] Cf. Dan. 5:10-12, 14-16.

[2] Daniel, however, was expected to reproduce the dream as well as interpret it. In Daniel 2 we encounter a new feature, namely, Jewish apocalyptic. On the relation between the apocalyptist and the sage, see D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 175-177.

fore the king (Dan. 2:12-16, 24 f.). In this story, as well as elsewhere in the book, stress is given to the fact that the wisdom displayed in Daniel comes not as a natural attribute, but rather as a special endowment of God: "The mystery which the king is requesting, no wise men, enchanters, magicians, or astrologers are able to make known. But there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries and he has made known to king Nebuchadnezzar...." (2:27); "But as for me, not because of any wisdom that I have..." (2:30). The same point can be observed in connection with the wisdom of Joseph[1] and of Solomon.[2] The superiority of the divinely inspired wisdom at Daniel's disposal stands out in contrast to the wisdom of the Babylonian sages. It is more than a question of the inferior wisdom of the Babylonians, however; the claims of the Chaldean counselors to possess wisdom and knowledge seem to be seriously challenged.[3] The reader is thus left to form his own conclusions as to whether the Babylonian sages possess any wisdom at all.

In the examples of Joseph, Solomon, and Daniel, then, one can see a tendency to emphasize the superiority of Israel's wisdom over that of the foreign countries. While this does not necessarily imply a denial of the idea of wisdom among the non-Israelite peoples, it may be seen as a step in that direction.

Another important factor in connection with the thesis of Bar. 3:15-31 is found in the attacks of the prophets against

---

[1]Cf. Gen 41:16,25,28,38-39.

[2]Cf. I Kgs. 3:5-14.

[3]Cf. Dan. 2:5-11.

the foreign wise men. Such attacks can be seen in the passages which deal with Yahweh's judgment upon the enemies of Israel, or upon the nations whose political policies run contrary to his plans.[1] The attacks of the prophets were not confined to the counselors of foreign nations; they were also directed against the statesmen of the Judaean kingdom.[2] The concern of this study, however, is to focus attention on the attitude of the prophets toward foreign wise men or the wisdom of foreign nations. Several passages will be cited to illustrate the position taken by the prophets. Our first example is found in Isaiah's prophecy against the king of Assyria. The arrogance and uncharacterized confidence of the Assyrian king is graphically portrayed in Isa. 10:5-14. The king of Assyria failed to recognize that he was only an instrument in the hands of Yahweh; his success in military matters was in accordance with Yahweh's design. Unaware of this fact, the Assyrian king considered his accomplishments to be the result of his own political and military wisdom:

> By the strength of my hand I have accomplished it,
> and by my wisdom, for I have understanding...
> (Isa. 10:13).

The folly of such assertions is seen in the doom that inevitably awaits the proud monarch and his nation. No matter how

---

[1] Cf. William McKane, Prophets and Wise Men (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965), pp. 65-78.

[2] Cf. Isa. 5:18-23; Israel as a nation comes under the attacks of the prophets also: she is foolish, stupid, and without understanding because she does not have a knowledge of Yahweh (Jer. 4:22; cf. Deut. 32:6,28-29).

clever the leader of Assyria may be, he cannot thwart the plan of Yahweh (10:15-19).

A similar message is directed against the statesmen of Egypt:

> How foolish are the princes of Zoan!
> the wisdom of Pharaoh's counselors is
> stupid counsel.
> How can you say to Pharaoh,
> "A son of the wise am I,
> a son of the kings of ancient times"?
> Where now are your wise men?
> let them tell you and make known
> what Yahweh Sebaoth has devised against
> Egypt!
> The princes of Zoan are foolish,
> the princes of Memphis are deluded.
> They -- the cornerstones of her tribes -- have
> led Egypt astray! (Isa. 19:11-13)

In biting sarcasm the prophet taunts the Egyptian statesmen.[1] The wise men of Egypt are nothing but fools! In their schemes to frustrate the plans of Yahweh they only display their own folly. There is no wisdom in Egypt. If the princes were truly wise they would understand that Yahweh is the one who controls history, and would seek to learn his will.

The biting scorn displayed toward foreign wisdom is found also in the oracles attributed to Jeremiah:

> There is no one like you Yahweh;
> you are great, and great in might is your
> name.
> Who will not fear you, O King of the nations?
> For this is your due;
> for among all the wise ones of the nations
> and in all of their kingdoms
> there is none like you.

---

[1]The expression "son of the wise" may be a reference to the professional training of the princes or to their ancestry (cf. McKane, op. cit., p. 69).

They are both foolish and stupid;
the instruction of idols is wood! (Jer. 10:6-8)[1]

In comparison with the wisdom of Yahweh[2] the wise men become fools; they are "nothing but brutes and blockheads";[3] they have no understanding. If they possess wisdom they would recognize the folly of idolatry and turn to the worship of the true God.[4]

In an oracle against Edom, Jeremiah is no less sarcastic:

Thus says Yahweh Sebaoth:
"Is wisdom no longer in Teman?
Has counsel perished from the discreet?
Has their wisdom disappeared?" (Jer. 49:7)

In Obadiah 8 we find a similar message directed against the Edomites:

"Surely, on that day", says Yahweh,
"I will destroy the wise men from Edom
and understanding from Mount Esau."

When the threat of judgment against Edom comes to fruition, the nation famous for her wisdom will be void of understanding; wisdom will vanish from her wise men; they will be incapable of offering counsel. In connection with the question of wisdom in Edom, R.H. Pfeiffer has made some interesting observations.[5]

---

[1]This passage appears also in Jer. 51:15 ff.

[2]The idea of the incomparability of Yahweh in connection with his wisdom and power will be treated in Chapter V.

[3]Cf. Lindblom, op. cit., p. 193.

[4]The folly of idolatry is treated by Deutero-Isaiah in connection with the question of Yahweh's wisdom and power. See Chapter V below.

[5]"Edomitic Wisdom", ZAW III-IV (1926-7), pp. 13-25.

Of special relevance are his comments on the text of Jer. 49:7, as well as Obadiah 8. In the Septuagint version, Pfeiffer states, there is evidence of an attempt to alter the original sense of the passage:

> The Septuagint text of Jer. 49:7 (οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι σοφία ἐν Θαιμαν), is based on a text in which הארן was deliberately changed to אין . In the case of Obad. 8 a glossator wrote on the margin, near ותבונה מהר עשו the words now found, out of their context, in v. 7b: אין ותבונה בו "there is no understanding in it" (i.e. in the Mount Esau).[1]

According to Pfeiffer's judgment, the attempt to alter the sense of the passages in Jeremiah and Obadiah clearly reflects the hostility which Israel felt toward Edom, especially in post-exilic times. The idea of wisdom among the Edomites probably seemed incredible to the pious Jews.[2]

The wise men of Babylon also come under the attacks of the prophet Jeremiah. In the day appointed for them they will perish and their counsel will come to naught (Jer. 50:35-36; 51:57). How helpless are her leaders in the day of judgment! How foolish are her sages in the time of crisis! They grope around in a stupor like drunk men.

In connection with the question of wisdom in Canaan we note the oracle against the prince of Tyre in the book of Ezekiel.

> Lo, you are wiser than Daniel;
> no secret is hidden from you.
> By your wisdom and discernment
> you have acquired wealth for yourself.

---

[1] "Edomitic Wisdom", pp. 13-14.

[2] Ibid.

and have gathered gold and silver
into your treasuries.
By your great wisdom in commerce
you have increased your wealth.
Therefore, thus says Yahweh...
"Behold, I am about to bring strangers against you,
the most terrifying of the nations;
and they shall draw their swords against the beauty
of your wisdom,
and defile your splendor. (Eze. 28:3-7)

The prince of Tyre in his claim to wisdom and power displays an arrogant disposition. Through extensive commercial operations and lustful schemes he was able to amass for himself a great treasury of wealth and power. But in his success he failed to recognize his own creaturely limits; consequently, he is about to experience the wrath of God's judgment. In ascribing wisdom to the prince of Tyre, the prophet focuses attention on the end to which misguided wisdom leads. To attempt to chart a course independent of God is utterly foolish and can only have disastrous consequences.

The oracle against the prince of Tyre is followed by a lamentation over the downfall of the king of Tyre (Eze. 28:11-19). The latter shares common features with the story of the Garden of Eden,[1] from which primeval man was expelled because of his corruption. The king of Tyre is said to have corrupted his wisdom through his arrogance. His exalted disposition,

---

[1]The view that Eze. 28:12-15 is a variation of the Paradise Story of Genesis has been challenged by J.L. McKenzie. After pointing out a number of divergences he remarks: "It is scarcely conceivable, if the Paradise story of Genesis was current, that the prophet would weaken his allusion by so altering it" ("The Literary Characteristics of Gen. 2-3", Myths and Realities: Studies in Biblical Theology [Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1963], p. 155).

however, has only brought the judgment of God upon himself, and has led to his own humiliation.

The passages cited above provide a general background of the attitude of the prophets toward foreign wisdom. When statesmen or leaders of foreign nations boast of their wisdom and power in defiance of Yahweh, their wisdom becomes "an object of biting scorn".[1] The position taken by the prophets is not unrelated to the thesis advanced by the author of Bar. 3: 15 ff. In Baruch, it is true, the position assumed by the author does not stem from a specific historical situation, such as we find in the messages of the prophets. Instead the theological stance of the author is based on his own observations of history: the nations and peoples of the earth are here for a moment, and then vanish away; they go down to Sheol without discovering wisdom. But one can observe some common ground between Baruch and the prophets: in the messages of the prophets, the leaders and statesmen of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Edom, and Canaan are all described in one way or another as being void of understanding. In Baruch this conclusion is presupposed: man, in spite of his urgent search for wisdom, has not discovered the way to knowledge and understanding; wisdom belongs to God alone. Hence, the various peoples surrounding Israel -- the Edomites, Ishmaelites, Canaanites, and others -- cannot claim wisdom for themselves.

The theological antecedents of the thesis in Baruch,

---

[1] Lindblom, op. cit., p. 193.

then, can be traced back, on the one hand, to the prophetic attacks on foreign wisdom, and on the other hand, to the tendency in the Old Testament to stress the superiority of Israel's wisdom over that of her neighbors. In later Judaism this tendency becomes more prominent. This may be seen in the works of Philo, for example, where the claims of Jewish wisdom are exaggerated in no small way.[1] Moreover, in Tobit it can be said, in accordance with the thesis in Baruch, that "none of the nations has understanding" (Tobit 4:19); wisdom comes to whomever God chooses to give it.[2]

Thus far we have dealt with the background of Bar. 3: 15 ff. in only general terms. Some consideration must be given also to the specific allusions which the author has made in the development of his thesis. Some scholars have seen in Bar. 3: 16 f. an allusion to Nebuchadnezzar.[3] The reference to the "rulers of the nations", those who "lorded over the beasts on the earth" and the ones who "have sport with the birds of the heavens" could apply to Nebuchadnezzar and his heirs. In Jer. 27:4-7 (cf. Jer. 28:14) the prophet announces Yahweh's plan to place all the lands under the dominion of Nebuchadnezzar.

---

[1]See Philo's treatise "On the Life of Moses". Cf. the statement of E.R. Goodenough: "It was Philo's triumphant boast that what the gentiles sought in ignorance the Jews had actually possessed in Moses" (An Introduction to Philo Judaeus [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940], p. 39).

[2]This tendency among the Jews is understandable when wisdom becomes identified with divine revelation. See T.K. Cheyne, Job and Solomon or the Wisdom of the Old Testament (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887), pp. 117-118.

[3]See R. Augé, Daniel. Lamentacions. Baruch. Lletra de Jeremias ("La Biblia", vol. XV, part II; Monestir de Montserrat, 1954), p. 285.

Nebuchadnezzar, his son, and his grandson are to rule "all the nations" of the earth. Moreover, their dominion is to extend even to the "beasts of the field". In the book of Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar's reign is said to include the "beasts of the field, and the birds of the heavens" (Dan. 2:37-38). In a number of passages in the Old Testament we find the expression "beasts of the earth" or "beasts of the field" parallel with the expression "birds of the heavens";[1] but nowhere else do we find these expressions appearing in connection with the rule of a foreign monarch. It is not improbable that the author of Bar. 3:16 f. was familiar with the prophecy of Jeremiah, and may have had this passage in mind. There is no evidence, however, of a direct literary relationship between Baruch and Jeremiah, in respect to this passage.

The reference to the giants in Bar. 3:26 is probably an allusion to Gen. 6:4. The verbal agreement between the two texts is close enough to suggest this:

Baruch 3:26	Genesis 6:4
ἐκεῖ ἐγεννήθησαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ὀνομαστοὶ οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς	ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος, οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί

According to the passage in Baruch the giants perished through their folly (Bar. 3:26-28). The connection between wisdom and the giants of primeval times, however, is not made in Genesis. According to the passage in Genesis the giants were destroyed

---

[1]Gen. 1:30; 9:2; Deut. 28:26; cf. Isa. 18:6; Hos. 4:3; Eze. 29:5; 31:6; Job 35:11, etc.

not because they lacked wisdom but because of their wickedness. Reference to the destruction of the giants appears elsewhere in Sir. 16:7; Wisd. 14:6; III Macc. 2:4; Enoch 7:10; Apoc. Bar. 56:15; etc. The connection between wisdom and the giants occurs in the passages of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon. In the former the giants appear among the lawless and ungodly who experience the wrath of God in contrast to the men of understanding who fear Yahweh. In the latter the giants are contrasted with the remnant whom God saved on a raft. According to Wisd. 10:4, Wisdom herself saved the righteous during the flood by steering the boat safely through the waters. The idea of the giants perishing because of their lack of wisdom, then, is not peculiar to Baruch but seems to have been a common theme in late Judaism. The connection between the fate of the giants and the idea of election,[1] however, is unique to Baruch; this question will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Wisdom and wealth. Another theme appearing in the context of Bar. 3:15-31 is the pursuit of riches (3:17-19). The individuals who engage in such pursuits appear in an unfavorable light. Their sole concern in life is to increase their own possessions. In greed they devise plans to acquire more wealth but only to experience anxiety. The acquisition of wealth, however, is of little value in the end; for the rich

---

[1]See above.

men vanish from the scene of their labors and leave behind no trace of their work. Their success in storing up great quantities of gold and silver is overshadowed by their failure to find wisdom. Wisdom remains inaccessible to the rich; it cannot be purchased with gold, for it is an object of incomparable value (3:29).

The pursuit of riches is a common theme, appearing in various forms in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament and later Judaism.[1] In Proverbs 10-29 we find a number of maxims on the possession of riches. At times wealth is regarded in a positive way: it is the reward of diligence whereas laziness leads to poverty (10:4); it is like a strong city in contrast to the ruins of the poor (10:15); it provides one with many friends whereas the poor have few (14:20; cf. 19:4,7). Wealth and wisdom, moreover, are associated in a positive way: the wise man, in contrast to the fool, is able to preserve his treasures (21:20; cf. 21:17); wisdom leads to riches and prosperity (19:8; 24:3-4). But there are also moments when wealth is less desirable, such as, when it brings anxiety (15:6), when the acquisition of it involves injustice (16:8), or when one must sacrifice his personal integrity (28:6). Wealth acquired through unscrupulous means is of no value: the wicked do not profit from their treasures (10:2); the wealth of the greedy dwindles away (13:11; 28:20); treasures acquired through deceit

---

[1] Cf. Roland E. Murphy, Introduction to the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1965), pp. 37 ff.

vanish (21:6; cf. 20:17); those who oppress the poor to increase their wealth end up in want themselves (22:16); wealth gained through interest will be left for others to enjoy (28:8). In some maxims the value of riches, regardless of how they were acquired, becomes questionable: in the day of judgment riches do not profit the individual (11:4); the one who puts his trust in riches is like a tree that withers (11:28); one should not take pains to acquire wealth, for such possessions only vanish away (23:4-5); "riches do not last forever" (27:24).

In Proverbs 10-29, then, we are able to observe a number of individual maxims drawn from the realm of human experience. No attempt is made to arrange these aphorisms in a systematic way to present a philosophical treatment of the subject. Instead they appear as independent, self-contained entities. In Sirach, however, we note an attempt to expand the individual maxim. This may be seen in the discourse on the rich and the poor. The rich man, in contrast to the poor man, has friends at his side in the time of need (13:21), is defended when in error (13:22), and is respected and praised by all (13:23). There is no peace between the rich and the poor (13:18); the poor are oppressed (13:19), and despised (13:20) by the rich. The possession of riches, however, does not always benefit the individual. The only wealth that is good is that which is acquired by just means (13:24). The selfish and envious do not enjoy their wealth (14:3); neither does the miser, who deprives himself of the comforts of life in order to hoard his posses-

sions (14:4-7). One should, therefore, enjoy his wealth during his lifetime, since he cannot take his treasures with him to Sheol (14:11-16).

The problem of the rich and the poor at times resembles the problem of the prosperity of the wicked, especially when the rich become wealthy at the expense of the poor. The passage Bar. 3:17-19 does not treat the problem of the prosperity of the wicked; it is concerned instead to show that the rich man, regardless of how much wealth he may acquire, cannot obtain wisdom. Nevertheless, the fate of the rich man in Baruch is similar to the fate of the wicked oppressor in some of the Wisdom Psalms. For example, in Psalm 37 the wicked, who gain wealth through oppression,[1] will fade like the grass of the field (vs. 2); their glory is like that of the pastures (vs. 20); they will vanish away like smoke disappearing in the air (vs. 20). In Psalm 49 the foolishness of trusting in riches is stressed. Those who trust in their wealth are not wise, for riches cannot save them from Sheol (vss. 6-9). The fool and the stupid perish and leave their wealth for others to enjoy (vs. 10); they go down to Sheol and waste away (vss. 13-14); when they die they cannot take the glory of their possessions

---

[1] In connection with the Wisdom Psalms and the problem of the uneven distribution of wealth, Mowinckel observes: "When a pious person is affected by personal tribulation, and particularly such as have to do with the difference between rulers and ruled, 'rich' and 'poor', then the problem about the unequal apportionment of the good things of life and about the 'ungodliness' and 'worldliness' of those in power would become a big issue" ("Psalms and Wisdom", SVT III [1955], p. 215).

with them (vss. 16 ff.). In Baruch, then, as well as in the Wisdom Psalms, the rich appear in an unfavorable light. The concern in Baruch, however, is not to stress the folly of trusting in riches, but the inability of wealth to procure wisdom.

The passage which comes closest to the sense of Bar. 3:17-19 is Job 28.[1] In fact, the thesis underlying the entire chapter[2] is virtually the same as that in Bar. 3:15-31, namely, that wisdom remains inaccessible to man. This concept of wisdom is different from that held by Job and his friends[3] elsewhere in the book, and has puzzled scholars for some time. The majority of scholars today consider the poem to be a later interpolation.[4] A few defend the poem as a genuine part of the original work.[5] Nearly all agree that its present position in the book is questionable, since the message expressed anticipates the speeches of Yahweh, and almost makes them unneces-

---

[1]A number of scholars have called attention to the correspondence in thought between Bar. 3:9-4:4 and Job 28. See, for example, Kneucker, op. cit., pp. 284 ff.; Penna, op. cit., pp. 921 f.

[2]An exception is verse 28, which seems to represent a different concept of wisdom from that found in the preceding verses (cf. Georg Fohrer, Das Buch Hiob [Gütersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963], p. 392).

[3]See Fohrer, op. cit., pp. 392 ff. for an analysis of the problem.

[4]See W. Baumgartner,"The Wisdom Literature", The Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H.H. Rowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 218; cf. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 458.

[5]See Eissfeldt, loc. cit.

sary.[1] That Job would arrive at such a conclusion apart from divine intervention does seem strange. We are not able to treat this problem in our study, however, but are concerned with the affinity between the thought of Bar. 3:15 ff. and Job 28. The thesis that wisdom is inaccessible to man has already been observed in Baruch. In Job 28 it can be seen in the following passages:

> But, as for wisdom, where shall it be found?[2]
> and where is the place of understanding?
> No one knows the way[3] to it.
> It is not found in the land of the living.
> (28:12-13)

> But, as for wisdom, from where does it come?
> and where is the place of understanding?
> It is concealed from the eyes of the living,
> and from the birds of the heavens it is
> hidden. (28:20-21)

The correspondence between Bar. 3:15 ff. and Job 28 extends beyond the question of the inaccessibility of wisdom. Some affinity can be observed also in respect to the creation motif in both passages. But this will be discussed in the next chap-

---

[1] Cf. E.G. Kraeling, The Book of the Ways of God (London: S.P.C.K., 1938), pp. 110-111; Kissane, op. cit., pp. 172-180; Eissfeldt, loc. cit.

[2] The MT reads מֵאַיִן תִּמָּצֵא . In the place of תִּמָּצֵא the manuscript Ken. 150 has תָּבוֹא . The latter verb appears in verse 20 of the same chapter, "from where does it come"; this may have influenced the reading in Ken. 150.

[3] The MT reads עֶרְכָּהּ "its price". The LXX, however, has ὁδὸν αὐτῆς which is probably based on the Hebrew word דַּרְכָּהּ. The latter reading makes better sense in this passage and, for that reason, was adopted. Later in the chapter wisdom appears as an object of incomparable value, a priceless possession. But in the immediate context the concern centers around the place of wisdom and the path leading to it.

ter. The material relevant to this chapter of our study is found in Job 28:1-22. In verses 1-13 the thought is advanced that silver, gold, and other precious treasures have their designated places. Though these materials are concealed from the average traveler, and are far removed from man's dwelling place, they have been made accessible by man's own technological ingenuity. But despite man's skill in uncovering the place of these treasures, he has not been able to discover the place of wisdom. The author turns from the illustration of mining to one involving man's commercial enterprises. In verses 14-22 scholars have noted allusions to Egyptian and Mesopotamian mythology.[1] Wisdom cannot be found in the deep nor with the sea, neither can it be purchased with the finest gold. Wisdom is an object of incomparable value; there is no material treasure equal to it.

The affinity between Bar. 3:15 ff. and Job 28:1 ff. can be seen, then, in respect to the following points: (1) the thesis brought forward in both passages, namely, that wisdom is inaccessible to man; (2) the contrast made between man's success in acquiring silver and gold and his failure to discover wisdom

---

[1]Cf. Terrien's observations: "The deep has not received her in her bosom nor the sea as a love mate. The divinities of the lowest hell and the last terror, Abaddon and Mot, give tantalizing answers, but they have only heard a whisper of her fame (Job: Poet of Existence [New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1957], pp. 173-174; cf. also Terrien, Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Job, IB [New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1954], III, 1104). According to the Babylonian cosmology Wisdom dwelt with the creator-god Ea in the depths of the sea (see K. Kaufmann, "Wisdom", The Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, 537.

(cf. Bar. 3:17 ff. and Job 28:3 ff.); and (3) the idea of the incomparability of wisdom (cf. Bar. 3:30 and Job 28:15-19).[1]

Some affinity between the language and style of both passages can be observed in the Greek.[2]

Baruch 3:15	Job 28:12
τίς εὗρε τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς	ἡ δὲ σοφία πόθεν εὑρέθη ποῖος δὲ τόπος ἐστὶν τῆς ἐπιστήμης
Baruch 3:20-21	**Job 28:13**
...ὁδὸν δὲ ἐπιστήμης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οὐδὲ συνῆκαν τρίβους αὐτῆς	οὐκ οἶδεν βροτὸς ὁδὸν αὐτῆς οὐδὲ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἐν ἀνθρώποις
Baruch 3:30	**Job 28:14-15**
τίς διέβη πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ εὗρεν αὐτὴν καὶ οἴσει αὐτὴν χρυσίου ἐκλεκτοῦ	...θάλασσα εἶπεν Οὐκ ἔστιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ....καὶ οὐ συμβασταχθήσεται χρυσίῳ...

It is clear from these passages that we do not have a case of literary dependence. But the common subject matter expressed in the form of rhetorical questions, as well as some affinity in language, seems to indicate an indirect relationship of some kind.

---

[1]The idea of the incomparability of wisdom appears also in the first part of the book of Proverbs (cf. R.N. Whybray, Wisdom in Proverbs [Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965], pp. 87-88).

[2]The differences between the MT and the LXX of the material from Job 28 are slight.

The two wisdom passages differ, however, in several respects. First, we note the questions raised in both passages. In Job the question is "Where shall wisdom be found?" or "From where does wisdom come?" Attention is called to the various places of the earth, the sea, and the sky: (1) the silver mines (vs. 1), (2) the place where gold is refined (vs. 1), (3) the place where iron is taken out of the earth (vs. 2), (4) the place where copper is smelted from ore (vs. 2), (5) the deep, dark places of the earth where ore is found (vs. 3), (6) the place where sapphire (or lapis lazuli) is hidden (vs. 6), (7) the mountains (vs. 9), (8) the deep (vs. 14), (9) the sea (vs. 14), and (10) the air (vs. 20). In Baruch, however, the question is "Who has found her place?" Attention in this passage is focused on the various peoples of the earth. As was noted above, the list contains non-Israelites only. The concern in Baruch is to emphasize, on the one hand, the fact that wisdom is not at man's disposal, and, on the other, that God has given this priceless gift to Israel his elect people.[1] This concern is absent in Job. Moreover, the final form of Job 28 identifies wisdom with piety and morality whereas the passage in Baruch identifies wisdom with the Torah.

Wisdom's dwelling place. Another way of expressing the inaccessibility of wisdom is found in Bar. 3:29-30. In this passage we note some verbal affinity with Deut. 30:12-13.

---

[1]See below.

Baruch 3:29-30	Deuteronomy 30:12-13[1]
τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ κατεβίβασεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν	Τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ λήμψεται αὐτὴν...
	(13) οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶν λέγων
(30) τίς διέβη πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ εὗρεν αὐτὴν ...	Τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λήμψεται ἡμῖν αὐτὴν ...

The immediate context of Deut. 30:12-13 consists of verses 11-12. This section is loosely connected with the preceding material (30:1-10). There is reason to believe that verses 11-12 did not form the sequel of verses 1-10 originally.[2] The material forms a part of Moses' farewell address to Israel. Israel is about to enter the land of Canaan and is reminded of their commitment to Yahweh. The nation is in great danger of forfeiting the blessings in store for them by departing from the divine statutes and commandments. Hence, they are summoned to obedience with a sense of urgency peculiar to the book of Deuteronomy.[3] In the appeal to Israel to listen to the revela-

---

[1]The LXX closely follows the MT here.

[2]Cf. S.R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy ("The International Critical Commentary"; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. lxxiv.

[3]von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 223 f.

tion of Yahweh, emphasis is given to the fact that the commandments are easy to fulfil. Yahweh's will is plain to Israel; hence, there is no reason for them to go astray or to seek additional instruction. The commandment is neither in heaven nor in some distant land inaccessible to Israel; it is near at hand. Yahweh's word is in the mouth and heart of the people. Israel need not question nor grope about in uncertainity. In the Torah[1] Yahweh has revealed himself fully. In the Midrash[2] we note the following commentary on this passage: "Moses said to Israel: 'Do not say: 'Another Moses will arise and bring us another Torah from heaven'; I therefore warn you, It is not in heaven, that is to say, no part of it has remained in heaven." Here it is emphasized again that the revelation of Yahweh is accessible to Israel; this is not to be disputed or questioned.[3]

The passage Deut. 30:12-14 is reinterpreted by Paul in Rom. 10:6-8. The two passages compare as follows:

Romans 10:6-8	Deuteronomy 30:12-14
...μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου	οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶν λέγων
τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν	Τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν

---

[1]Cf. Isa. 45:19.

[2]Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy, translated by J. Rabbinowitz (London: Soncino Press, 1939), p. 153.

[3]Cf. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 228: "This revelation of Jahweh is so all-sufficient as to exempt Israel from all seeking and questioning and doubting"; and again: "Nothing would be more absurd than that Israel should once again let this revelation become a problem for her" (p. 231).

Romans 10:6-8	Deuteronomy 30:12-14
οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν ἢ	οὐρανὸν καὶ λήμψεται αὐτὴν ἡμῖν; καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτὴν ποιήσομεν
	(13) οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶν λέγων Τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης
(7) τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν	
(8) ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου...	(14) ἔστιν σου ἐγγὺς τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου...

Paul is discussing the doctrine of righteousness based on faith as opposed to the righteousness that comes through obedience to the Torah. Salvation comes to the individual who confesses in faith that Jesus is Lord. Paul makes this contrast, strangely enough, by citing a passage which clearly emphasizes the possibility of fulfilling the demands of Yahweh through obedience. He reinterprets the passage in Deuteronomy by omitting certain parts of the text and adding other phrases. The parenthetical comments in an obvious manner apply the text to Christ. Both passages, however, stress the accessibility of the desired object; in Romans it is righteousness by faith, in Deuteronomy it is the revelation of the will of Yahweh and the

possibility of fulfilling Yahweh's demands.

Returning to our passage Bar. 3:29-30 we are able to note some verbal agreement with Deut. 30:12-13. The parallels between the two passages raise the question of literary dependence. The verbal agreement is not exact, for the author of Bar. 3:29-30 has omitted some words and added others. Neither is the text in Baruch a paraphrase of the Deuteronomic passage, for the sense of the passage in Deuteronomy has been altered by the changes in Baruch. In Deuteronomy, as we already noted, the accessibility of the divine revelation is stressed whereas in Baruch the equivalent is inaccessible. It is true that this difference is only apparent, since the author later in the passage states that God gave wisdom to Israel. Nevertheless, insofar as the non-Israelites are concerned, wisdom is inaccessible; the author emphasizes this point by using words and phrases found in the passage of Deuteronomy. This particular literary method has also been observed above in connection with the passage Gen. 6:4. In his reference to the giants and their failure to discover wisdom, the author makes use of the vocabulary of Gen. 6:4 while departing from the sense of the passage. This method of using Scriptural terms and expressions in the construction of one's own message has been identified by A. Robert as "anthological composition".[1] In a series of articles based on a study of Proverbs 1-9,[2] Robert attempts to show that

---

[1]"Litteraires (Genres)", Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplement V (1957), 411 ff.

[2]"Les Attaches Litteraires Bibliques de Prov. I-IX", Revue Biblique XLIII (1934) 42-68, 172-204, 374-384; XLIV

the author of these chapters makes use of the terms and phrases of earlier Biblical books in the formulation of his own message. The same phenomenon has been observed elsewhere, in the literature of later Judaism.[1]

The passage Bar. 3:29-30, then, has a note of pessimism,[2] insofar as the question of the accessibility of wisdom is concerned. In this respect it comes close to the mood of Prov. 30:4. There may be an indirect relationship between the two passages:

Baruch 3:29	Proverbs 30:4
τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν	τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν	
καὶ κατεβίβασεν	καὶ κατέβη ....

A mood of pessimism and agnosticism can be observed in the verses preceding the rhetorical question:

> For I am more foolish than man
> and have not the understanding of man.
> I have not learned wisdom
> nor have I experienced a knowledge of
> the Holy One. (Prov. 30:2-3)

In these verses the author admits that he is unable to acquire wisdom; but the first part of verse 4 suggests that he probably included mankind as well. The meaning of the passage is not

---

(1935) 344-365, 502-525.

[1]Cf. Murphy, op. cit., p. 45.

[2]In the Akkadian work "A Pessimistic Dialogue Between Master and Servant", the question is asked, "Who is tall enough to ascend to heaven? Who is broad enough to embrace the earth?" (See James B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament [second edition; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1955], p. 438).

clear; this is due partly to the problem of authorship.[1] Verses 1-4 are believed to be the work of a non-Israelite named Agur. The remaining portion of the chapter has been assigned to an orthodox Jewish scribe.[2] It is not certain whether the opening verses are to be understood as an admission of man's inability to comprehend God or a denial of God's existence;[3] the concluding portion of the chapter (especially verses 7-9) seems to favor the latter. But these verses, if from a later hand, only indicate one way in which the earlier passage was understood. What is of interest to us is the admission of man's inability to acquire wisdom. This is closely associated with the acknowledgment of man's inability to understand God. Both admissions are followed by the question "Who has ascended to heaven?" and, therefore, imply that wisdom and a knowledge of God are inaccessible to man. Prov. 30:4 contains a series of rhetorical questions which correspond to those raised in Job 38:1 ff.[4] In both passages man's inability to comprehend the mysteries of the universe is stressed.

The connection between the idea of the inaccessibility of wisdom and that of comprehending the deity appears also in

---

[1] R.B.Y. Scott, Proverbs. Ecclesiastes ("The Anchor Bible", XVIII; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 176.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Cf. C.H. Toy, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs ("The International Critical Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), pp. 521-522.

[4] Cf. Toy, loc. cit.

Job 11:5-9.

> But oh, that God would speak,
> and open his lips with you,
> And declare to you the secrets of wisdom!...
> Can you find out the deep things of God?
> Can you fully discover the limit of the
> Almighty?
> It is higher than the heavens,
> what can you do?
> It is deeper than Sheol,
> what can you know?
> It is longer than the earth in measure;
> it is wider than the sea.

The questions raised in this passage clearly set forth man's finitude. Because of his creaturely limitations man is incapable of comprehending God; God's wisdom is hidden from him. Wisdom here is closely associated with divine revelation, and has to do with a knowledge of God. But such is not at man's disposal. The recognition of this fact offers little hope to the sufferer.

According to R.H. Pfeiffer "the Weltanschauung" of the Edomite sages was "pessimistic and agnostic".[1] God remains unknown to mortal man; his works cannot be understood, nor his purposes discerned. The idea that divine revelation was accessible to man found no place in the Wisdom Literature of Edom.[2] Whether or not Pfeiffer is correct in ascribing these views to the Edomite sages is not the concern of this study. We have noted, however, in the passages cited above, a certain pessimism bordering on a mood of despair. This pessimistic element, as observed above, appears also in Baruch, but only in connection

---

[1] "Edomitic Wisdom", p. 22.

[2] Ibid.

with the idea of wisdom and the non-Israelites. Wisdom, for the author of Bar. 3:9-4:4, is the divine revelation entrusted to Israel. Hence the author can conclude with the words:

> Happy are we O Israel,
> for what is pleasing to God is known to us.
> (Bar. 4:4)

The knowledge of what is pleasing to God is found in the Torah, the pride of Israel.

The rhetorical questions in Baruch deserve some attention: "Who has found her place?" (3:15); "Who has entered into her treasury?" (3:15); "Where are the rulers of the nations?" (3:16 ff.); "Who has ascended to heaven...?" (3:29); "Who has crossed over the sea...?" (3:30). We find similar rhetorical questions, but in much greater profusion, in Job 38:[1] "Where were you?... Tell me" (vs. 4); "Who determined its measurements?" (vs. 5); "Have you commanded?" (vs. 12); "Have you entered the springs of the sea?" (vs. 16); "Have the gates of death been revealed to you?" (vs. 17); "Where is the way to the dwelling of light?" (vs. 19); "Have you entered the treasury of the snow?" (vs. 22). The rhetorical questions in Job have the same ironical ring as those in Baruch. The purpose of the questions in Job 38 is to point out to man (Job) his crea-

---

[1] Cf. G. von Rad, "Job XXXVIII and Ancient Egyptian Wisdom", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 281-291. In this study von Rad makes some interesting comments about the rhetorical questions in Job 38. He calls attention to the Egyptian document Papyrus Anastasi I where a series of rhetorical questions, similar to those found in Job, appear, and suggests that such questions originally were asked in the Egyptian schools where the future governors of the provinces received instruction about the geography of Egypt's neighbors (pp. 288-289).

turely limitations. He cannot solve the riddles of creation; they remain a mystery to him. In his finiteness he can only stand in awesome wonder before the wisdom and power of the Creator. In Baruch man's vain attempts to discover wisdom are also contrasted with the wisdom and power of God, but, in a less dramatic way. The wisdom and power of God, moreover, appear in connection with the creation of the universe, a topic to be discussed in Chapter V. Emphasis upon God's wisdom and power leads to a statement of God's incomparability. The idea of God's incomparability, furthermore, appears in connection with his choice of Israel and his gift of wisdom in the form of the Torah.[1] The questions in Baruch which stress man's inability to acquire wisdom, therefore, can be seen to emphasize not only God's incomparability, but also the uniqueness of Israel.[2]

---

[1]This will be shown in Chapter VI.

[2]The question of Israel's uniqueness will be treated in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER V

WISDOM AND CREATION

The format of this chapter will be similar to the one followed in Chapter IV. A brief outline of the material in Baruch will be presented first; a discussion of the general background of the material will follow next.

WISDOM AND CREATION IN BARUCH

The material in this chapter will be discussed under two headings: (1) Wisdom and the Creator and, (2) Wisdom and the created works. Under the first heading consideration will be given to the idea of God's dwelling place in connection with his ownership of the universe, the wisdom and power of God in connection with his activity as Creator, and the wisdom and power of God in connection with the idea of his incomparability. Under the second heading attention will be focused on the concept of Wisdom as a separate entity, independent of God, and the theme of the descent of Wisdom and her dwelling on earth.

Wisdom and the Creator. The creation motif in Baruch consists of verses 24-25, 32-38. Verses 24-25 contain a reference to creation, and, for that reason, were included in this

chapter of the study. In Bar. 3:24 the expression "the house of God" (ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ) refers to the vast universe of the Creator rather than to the temple in Jerusalem. It stands parallel with the phrase "the place of his possession" or "the place he possesses" (ὁ τόπος τῆς κτήσεως αὐτοῦ[1]). Its territory has no limits and therefore cannot be measured. Some scholars understand both expressions to mean God's dwelling place in the heavens.[2] But reference to the giants of primeval times, and their dwelling there (vs. 26),[3] seems to imply that the author was thinking of the entire creation of God. Verses 24-25 interrupt the argument advanced by the author, and may be seen as an interlude by which the author briefly pauses in order to draw the attention of his readers to the vastness of God's creation. The mood is one of praise and admiration; reflection on the infinite dwelling place of God produces an overwhelming sense of wonder. The fact that man cannot measure its boundaries implies that he is not capable of grasping its significance.[4]

In verses 32-38 two concepts of wisdom appear. On the one hand, wisdom is seen as a divine attribute alongside God's

---

[1]This phrase can also be translated "the place of his creatures" (cf. Ps. 104:24 in the LXX).

[2]See Wambacq's commentary on Baruch, pp. 376-377.

[3]See the translation in the CCD: "In it were born the giants, renowned at the first" (Bar. 3:26), and in the RSV: "The giants were born there, who were famous of old".

[4]Cf. the language used in Job 11:7-9, where the view is expressed that man is incapable of comprehending God.

power in the creation of the universe. On the other hand, Wisdom appears as a separate entity, independent of God. The latter has to do with the personification of wisdom and will be discussed below. God's wisdom is seen first in his discovery of the way to knowledge. God is omniscient; he discovered the dwelling place of wisdom by his own understanding (vs. 32). By ascribing wisdom to God and by crediting him with the discovery of knowledge, the author emphasizes the fact that wisdom is God's exclusive possession, and contrasts God's discovery with the futile attempts of man. God's discovery of wisdom appears in connection with his activity as Creator. Here we note also an emphasis on God's power. The earth was prepared to last forever and is filled with four-footed creatures. The author also directs attention to God's activity in the cosmos. The light and the stars are personified to add emphasis to God's power in maintaining the works of his creation. God sends forth the light and it goes; he calls it back and it returns to him in fear (vs. 33). The verse may be a description of the morning and evening cycle. At the command of God the light goes forth from its chambers to issue in a new day; it returns also when God calls, and thus allows the coming of night. The stars appear as faithful sentinels on duty in the heavens. They are happy to shine for their Commander. When he calls them, they reply, "Here we are!" (vs. 34). These stars, the author adds, were made by God (vs. 35).

The idea of the incomparability of God follows next. In view of his discovery of wisdom and his activity as Creator,

there is no one who can compare with him (vs. 36). The idea of the incomparability of God is seen in connection with his choice of Israel as his people. This God who accomplished all these things is Israel's God. After he discovered the whole way to knowledge he gave her to Israel, his beloved servant (vs. 37).

Wisdom and the created works. The personification of wisdom can be seen in the author's reference to it as an independent entity dwelling in the cosmos. Wisdom, as such, was not created but was discovered, presumably when God began his creative activity, although this is not very clear. Wisdom, therefore, is not a creature, but seems to have existed eternally in the cosmos. The question then arises, Is Wisdom to be understood as a mythological figure? The question cannot be easily dismissed in view of verse 38: "After this she appeared on earth and moved about (συναναστράφη) among men". A number of critics regard this verse as a later interpolation, inserted into the text by a Christian scribe.[1] Its universalistic tone is understood to be inconsistent with the particularistic outlook expressed throughout the passage.[2] The Church fathers frequently cite this passage as a proof text of the Incarnation,[3] thus showing how such a passage served Christian

---

[1]See Chapter I.

[2]See Chapter I.

[3]See Chapter III.

interests. These objections, however, do not seriously militate against the authenticity of this verse. We have no evidence from the manuscript authorities which would lead us to question its genuineness. If the verse was introduced by a Christian scribe it would be inserted at an early date. At the same time, we see no reason why this verse could not have been a part of the original text. This will be seen more clearly when we consider the background of the material.[1] The question concerning the concept of wisdom will also be considered later in the study.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE MATERIAL IN BARUCH

Wisdom and the Creator

The idea of God's dwelling place in connection with his ownership of the universe. The expression "the house of God" occurs frequently in the Old Testament, but usually as a reference to the temple in Jerusalem,[2] or as a designation of a cultic site.[3] In the story of Jacob's dream at Bethel, for example, the expression is used to denote the manifestation of

---

[1]This will be seen in connection with the theme of the descent of wisdom and her dwelling among men.

[2]This is especially so in I & II Chronicles.

[3]See Walter Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by John Baker ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), II, 190.

God's presence. In reverence and fear Jacob exclaims, "How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God..." (Gen. 28:17). In the book of Hosea there are at least two instances where the land of Canaan is referred to as Yahweh's house,[1] but such references are infrequent in the Old Testament.[2] We do not find this expression used anywhere in the Old Testament to indicate the entire creation of God.[3] Nevertheless, a connection can be seen between the designation of the house of God as vast and unlimited, and the statements which express the inadequacy of a particular site to serve as God's dwelling-place. This can be seen, for example, in the prayer of dedication offered by Solomon: "But will God truly dwell upon the earth? Lo, the heavens and the heaven of heavens cannot contain you. How much less this house which I have built!" (I Kgs. 8:27; cf. II Chron. 6:18). This verse appears in the prayer as a parenthetical insertion; it can be easily removed from the context without disturbing the sense of the passage. It has been suggested that the verse was added by a later hand to counteract the notion that the deity could be confined to a definite place.[4] The idea of Yahweh's dwelling

---

[1]Hos. 8:1; 9:15; cf. D. Ernst Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch ("Kommentar zum Alten Testament"; Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1929), XII, 86, 100.

[2]Cf. Num. 12:7 and Jer. 12:7.

[3]Cf. Bissell, op. cit., p. 428 who reaches the same conclusion.

[4]See John Gray, I & II Kings ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 205.

in heaven is not limited to a particular period[1] but occurs in a number of passages throughout the Old Testament.[2] What is of interest to us is the tendency to speak of Yahweh's exalted position above the heavens and the earth. This tendency can be seen in the message of the prophets, where one can observe "a special sensitivity" to Yahweh's exaltedness,[3] and especially so in the post-exilic writings, where emphasis is given to Yahweh's universal dominion. We note, for example, the passage Isa. 66:1,[4]

> Thus says the Lord:
> "The heavens are my throne
> and the earth is my footstool.
> Where is this house that you will build
> for me,
> and where is the place of my rest?"

Undoubtedly, the destruction of the temple and the exile of Israel from their homeland had some bearing on Israel's faith, and may have also influenced her views regarding Yahweh's dwelling-place, and his relation to the land.[5] In regard to the latter we find a number of statements in the Old Testament which represent different points of view. G. von

---

[1] Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 190.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 191.

[4] Cf. Jer. 23:24. Yahweh fills heaven and earth; there is no place where man can hide from him. Cf. also Ps. 139:7-10.

[5] Cf. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 194: "...for the priest who has had to live through the destruction of the Temple the transcendence of God is an anchor for his faith, without which it would inevitably have suffered shipwreck. At the same time, however, this king of heaven is for him the one who acts in the present moment, who calls his messengers to himself even in the unclean land of exile and carries on his works."

Rad[1] makes a distinction between the statements expressing Yahweh's promise of the land of Canaan to the patriarchs, and those which express his ownership of the land. Originally these statements were separate, belonging to two completely different realms.[2] The land promised to the patriarchs is never referred to as "Yahweh's land" but as the land which formerly belonged to other nations.[3] It was the land Yahweh gave to Israel "in the course of a series of historical events".[4] The idea of the land promised to the patriarchs is thus a historical conception whereas the idea of Yahweh's land is a notion belonging to the realm of the cult.[5] In connection with the latter we note a number of proscriptions against a cultic defilement of the land, such as those against sexual offences, and the defilement of the land resulting from unburied dead bodies.[6] Foreign territory, in contradistinction to the territory of Yahweh, is unclean; it is the domain of other gods.[7]

The idea of Yahweh's ownership of the land of Canaan, it is believed, was later associated with the idea of his ownership of the entire earth.[8] The latter notion does not occur

---

[1] "The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 79-93.

[2] Ibid., p. 85.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 88.

[6] Lev. 18:25-29; 29:29; 20:22-24; Deut. 21:22 ff.; 24:4.

[7] I Sam. 26:19; Hos. 9:3 f.; Amos 7:17.

[8] Hyacinthe-M. Dion, "Yahweh, Dieu de Canaan, et la terre des hommes", CJT XIII/4 (Oct., 1967), p. 240.

often in the Old Testament.[1] When it does appear, it is not associated with one particular concept, but occurs in connection with a number of different themes.[2] Yahweh's ownership of the earth, however, is ultimately related to his activity as Creator. Since Yahweh is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, it follows that he is also the rightful owner:

> The heavens are yours and also the earth;
> the world and all that is in it, you have
> established them.
> The north and the south, you have created them;
> Tabor and Hermon ring out in exultation.
> (Ps. 89:12-13)

One further observation must be made in respect to the passage Bar. 3:24-25. A connection may be seen between the reference to the creation as the house of God, on the one hand, and the statements in the Old Testament, on the other hand, which conceive the creation as the erection of a gigantic building. One of the first essential steps is that of measuring. But such a feat can be accomplished only by God, for man in his finitude cannot comprehend the expanse of the earth.[3] In Baruch emphasis on the limitless creation of God is in harmony with the author's thesis of the inaccessibility of wisdom:

---

[1] Dion, op. cit., p. 240.

[2] For example in Deut. 10:14-15 the idea of God's ownership of the heavens and the earth appears in connection with the theme of Israel's election; God's ownership of the world can be seen also in connection with his activity as Creator (Ps. 24:1-2). Ps. 96:3-7 contains a wealth of theological themes. Here we see the idea of God's ownership associated with the idea of his kingship, and his incomparability, his creative activity, and his election of Israel.

[3] Cf. Job 28:18, "Have you considered diligently the broad expanse of the earth?"

man who is incapable of measuring the universe is also unable to discover wisdom.

The wisdom and power of God in connection with his activity as Creator. Wisdom as a divine attribute appears late in the history of Israel,[1] and by no means is a feature peculiar to the Israelite religion; numerous examples can be given to show that it was the common property of the gods in the religions of the ancient Near East.[2] Moreover, in comparison to the spirit and word of Yahweh, wisdom as a divine attribute, plays a much less important role.[3] It is only when we turn to the literature of later Judaism, especially the Wisdom of Solomon, that we find a more prominent place given to wisdom.[4] According to M. Noth,[5] the statement "God is wise" occurs infrequently in the Old Testament. Its equivalent, however, appears more often.

In a number of passages where it appears as a divine attribute, wisdom is associated with God's activity as Creator.

---

[1]Cf. M. Noth, "Die Bewährung von Salomos 'Gottlicher Weisheit'", SVT III (1955), p. 232.

[2]Cf. H. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East (Lund: H. Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947).

[3]Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 81.

[4]Cf. H. Duesberg et I. Fransen, Les Scribes Inspires: Introduction aux Livres Sapientiaux de la Bible (revised edition; Belgium: Éditions de Maredsous, 1966), pp. 847 ff.

[5]"Die Bewährung von Salomos 'Gottlicher Weisheit'", p. 232.

This can be seen, for example, in Prov. 3:19-20:

> By wisdom Yahweh founded the earth;
> by understanding he made the heavens firm.
> By his knowledge the deep places break open,
> and the clouds drip dew.

As a divine attribute wisdom is closely associated with God's power in creation. This may be seen especially in the book of Job.[1] Following Bildad's discourse on the justice of God, Job remarks: "He [God] is wise in mind and mighty in strength" (Job 9:4 ff.). This statement is followed by a reference to God's creative activity (9:10-12). In the final speech of Elihu (36:1 ff.) attention is focused on the wisdom and power of God as manifested in the phenomena of nature; this can be seen especially in connection with the meteorological phenomena. Of particular relevance to our passage in Baruch is the emphasis upon the wisdom and power of God in directing the forces of nature to accomplish his purpose: At God's command the lightning goes forth to strike the designated mark (36:32); its crashing reveals the power of its maker (36:33); the clouds are prepared to accomplish all that he commands (37:11-12). At the breath of God ice is formed, the great waters become frozen (37:10). These statements are followed by a series of questions which emphasize man's inability to penetrate the wisdom of God; he can not understand how God can command the lightning to flash or direct the clouds in the heavens, etc. (37:15,16).

---

[1] This point is given special emphasis by Kissane (The Book of Job [New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946], pp. xxvii-xxix).

The wisdom and power of God in nature are set forth with greater emphasis and more detail, however, in the speeches of Yahweh (Job 38-41). In these speeches a series of questions appears which baffle Job and cause him to shrivel into a state of insignificance. Throughout the discourse between Job and his friends, Job had challenged God's wisdom and power in managing the world. In the speeches of Yahweh the situation has changed: Job is challenged now by Yahweh. The origin and nature of light and darkness, snow and hail, rain and dew, etc., as well as the regulation of the natural phenomena (38:1-41), remain a mystery to him. The passage dealing with the activity of lightning is of interest to us because of the verbal agreement with Bar. 3:33-35. The Greek text of Baruch is closer to the Masoretic text of Job than it is to the text of Job preserved in the Septuagint.

Baruch 3:33-35	Job 38:35
ὁ ἀποστέλλων τὸ φῶς, καὶ	הַתְּשַׁלַּח בְּרָקִים
πορεύεται	וְיֵלֵכוּ
καὶ εἶπαν Πάρεσμεν	וְיֹאמְרוּ לְךָ הִנֵּנוּ

The verbal agreement between the two passages is close enough for one to suggest that Bar. 3:33-35 is probably an allusion to the text of Job. But it cannot be considered an actual paraphrase of Job 38:35, since it has additional material which alters the sense of the passage. The full text in Baruch reads:

> He who sends forth the light and it goes,
> he called it, and it obeyed him in fear.
> The stars shone at their posts, and were glad,
> he called them, and they said, "Here we are!"

The passage in Job is concerned with the ordering of lightning whereas in Baruch the concern is with the regulation of light and the stars.

The reference to the stars in Bar. 3:35 deserves further comment. The stars as heavenly creatures rejoice before their Creator. The mood of joy among the heavenly creatures in connection with the event of creation can be seen also in Job 38:6-7:

> On what were its pedestals settled,
> or who laid its cornerstone,
> when the morning stars gave a ringing cry,
> and all the sons of God shouted in applause?

The celestial beings witness the creation of the earth and rejoice in God's work.[1] In Job, and especially in Baruch, the stars have been reduced to a subordinate position and are deprived of independent significance. In Baruch they are subservient to God; their creatureliness is stressed in connection with the role they perform; they are at God's disposal, ready to carry out his wishes.[2] The role assigned to the stars in Baruch is similar to the one in Sir. 43:9-10. In both passages the stars appear as faithful sentinels at their posts of duty in response to the word of their Creator. The idea of the stars as sentinels calls to mind a number of passages in

---

[1]Cf. M.H. Pope, Job ("The Anchor Bible", XV; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 183: "The song of the morning stars is not merely a poetic figure .... The morning stars certainly include the planet Venus, the brilliant morning and evening 'star'; cf. Isa. xiv, 12; II Pet. i, 19".

[2]In Ps. 104:4 the winds are Yahweh's messengers, and the fire his ministers.

the Old Testament, where the stars comprise part of Yahweh's hosts.[1]

In Bar. 3:33-35 and Job 38, then, we note a concern to emphasize the power and wisdom of God in regulating the activity of the natural phenomena. In the latter this is achieved through a series of rhetorical questions which are intended to humble Job. Throughout the discourses with his friends Job defended his own integrity and was accused of entertaining arrogant notions about his own wisdom.[2] Before the revelation of God's wisdom and might Job is brought into full realization of his own creatureliness. The author of the wisdom passage in Baruch, however, has already settled the question of man's finitude by claiming that no one has found wisdom. Therefore, instead of posing questions which would by implication reveal the wisdom and power of God, he makes assertions in a form and style reminiscent of Deutero-Isaiah. This can be observed in the author's use of the participle: "NO one knows...but he who knows all things..." (vss. 31-32); "he who prepared the earth ..." (vs. 32); "he who sends forth the light..." (vs. 33). Among the passages in Deutero-Isaiah which treat the theme of Yahweh's wisdom and power in creation is Isa. 40:22 ff.,[3] "He

---

[1]Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by J.A. Baker ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), I, 193.

[2]Cf. Job 15:1-11, especially the allusions to the myth of the Primeval Man. Cf. I. Engnell, "'Knowledge' and 'Life' in the Creation Story", SVT III (1955), p. 111.

[3]The reference to Yahweh's wisdom appears earlier in the chapter (cf. Isa. 40:12 ff.).

is the one who sits upon the vault of the earth...who stretches out the heavens like a curtain...."

In Baruch God's wisdom and power are attributes which distinguish him from everyone else. This is true also of the passage in Deutero-Isaiah, as well as a number of other Old Testament passages.[1] This leads us to the consideration of another major theme introduced by our author, namely, the idea of the incomparability of God.

The wisdom and power of God in connection with the idea of his incomparability. In a recent publication entitled, The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament,[2] C.J. Labuschagne attempts to show the significance of the concept of incomparability for an understanding of Old Testament theology. The idea of the incomparability of the deity was not confined to Israel but seems to have been a characteristic way of expressing the distinctive qualities of a particular god in the Assyro-Babylonian[3] and Egyptian[4] religions. But there is no conclusive evidence that Israel merely borrowed the concept from her neighbors and adapted it in accordance with her own interests. Because of the importance of such a concept for an understanding of the background of the wisdom passage in Baruch, we will briefly summarize the thesis advanced by

---

[1] See below.

[2] Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.

[3] Ibid., pp. 33-57.

[4] Ibid., pp. 58-61.

Labuschagne, by focusing attention on those aspects which are relevant to our study. The concept of incomparability is expressed in a number of different ways and is not limited to Israel's understanding of God.[1] The two principal ways are the negation and the rhetorical question.[2]

The statements expressing Yahweh's incomparability are more than appellations or "epithets of praise"; they constitute the very substance of the passage in which they are found and cannot be lifted out of their context without doing harm to the sense of the passage. The theological significance of these expressions, moreover, can be determined only as one examines them in their wider context.[3] Of all the factors which have given rise to the idea of Yahweh's incomparability the one which dominates is his miraculous intervention in history as the deliverer of Israel. Throughout the Old Testament one can see a close connection between Yahweh's incomparability and his participation in the history of his people as their God:[4] no god has ever attempted to take a nation for himself out from the midst of another nation as Yahweh has done (Deut. 4:34); there is none like Yahweh among the gods; he is powerful in deeds and wonders (Ex. 15:1-18,21).[5] The activity of Yahweh as Creator has also contributed to the formulation of the idea of his incomparability; but his activity as Creator remains

---

[1] Labuschagne, op. cit., pp. 8-23.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 65.

[4] Ibid., p. 91.

[5] Ibid., pp. 91 ff.

subordinate to his activity in history. References to Yahweh's creative activity which relate to his incomparability are found in I Sam. 2:8; Ps. 89:10 ff.; Jer. 10:16 and Isa. 40:18,25. In all these passages the creative activity of Yahweh appears as "an additional quality of the God who intervenes in history"[1] as Israel's Redeemer. In the "Song of Hannah", the connection between Yahweh's creative activity and his incomparability is secondary; the primary concern of the passage is to emphasize his miraculous intervention in history. Yahweh's activity as Creator in Ps. 89:10 ff. illustrates his unique power, but does not constitute the main part of the hymn; emphasis is given to his activity as Redeemer. In Jer. 10:16 the idea of Yahweh as Creator is connected with the fact of his creating Israel: "Not like these is he who is the portion of Jacob, for he is the one who formed all things, and Israel is the tribe of his inheritance -- Yahweh Sebaoth is his name!" The emphasis, however, is not laid on the creation of Israel, but rather on the creation of "all things" (Israel included), and is done to stress the fact that Yahweh is distinct from the idols. A contrast between Yahweh and the idols, as well as the idol-makers, can be clearly seen in the passage preceding Jer. 10:16:

> Thus you will say to them:
> "The gods who did not make the heavens and
> the earth
> shall perish from the earth and from under
> these heavens.
> He [Yahweh] is the one who made the earth
> by his power,

---

[1]Labuschagne, op. cit., p. 108.

who established the world by his wisdom,
and by his understanding stretched out
the heavens...
Every man is foolish and without knowledge,
every smelter is put to shame by his idols;
because his images are worthless,
and no breath is in them." (Jer. 10:11-14)

In this passage the prophet calls attention to the power and wisdom of Yahweh as manifested in his creative activity, and contrasts these attributes with the weakness of the idols and the stupidity of the craftsmen who make them. The idea of Yahweh's incomparability follows next. The factors which make Yahweh utterly distinctive from the idols and the craftsmen are his wisdom and power which enable him to create the heavens and the earth; hence these factors constitute an important element for the prophet in the concept of Yahweh's incomparability.

In Isa. 40:25-26 we note also a connection between Yahweh's activity as Creator and the idea of his incomparability:

To whom then will you compare me,
that I should be like him? says the Holy One.
Lift up your eyes on high and see:
Who has created these?
He who brings out their host by number,
and calls all of them by name;
by greatness of strength and mighty power
not one is missing.[1]

---

[1]The wisdom and power of Yahweh in connection with his numbering and naming the stars can be clearly seen in Ps. 147: 4-5. This occurs in the context of Yahweh's activity in history where Yahweh's universal dominion and goodness is stressed: Yahweh who controls the movements of the stars and assigns each their place in the heavens is also the one who controls the destinies of nations; he determines the course of history, as well as of nature (vss. 1-3, 6-20).

Where Yahweh's creative activity is emphasized in connection with his incomparability we note also a reference to his power. Yahweh's power is manifested in his creation and regulation of the celestial bodies: at his command they all respond in an orderly procession. In Isa. 40:25-26 the object against which Yahweh's incomparability is asserted is probably the idols, although it is possible that the author is alluding to the astral deities of Israel's neighbors.[1] In the cults of Mesopotamia, it was generally held, the stars as astral deities determined the destiny of mankind;[2] hence, man's fate could be learned in advance by a study of the movement of the celestial bodies. In Deutero-Isaiah, as elsewhere, the stars are stripped of their power and importance and become servants of Yahweh.

The wisdom of Yahweh for Deutero-Isaiah is also an important factor in the concept of his incomparability:

> Who has measured the waters in the hollow
> of his hand
> and meted out the heavens with a span...?
> Who has directed the Spirit of Yahweh,
> and who as his counselor instructed him?
> Whom did he consult for his discernment,

---

[1]Cf. James D. Smart, History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 60.

[2]Cf. the statement of von Rad in connection with his commentary on the creation of the stars mentioned in Gen. 1: 16: "To comprehend the significance of these statements, one must remember that they were formulated in a cultural and religious atmosphere that was saturated with all kinds of astrological false belief. All ancient Oriental (not Old Testament!) thinking with regard to time was determined by the cyclical course of the stars" (Genesis, p. 54).

and who taught him the path of justice,
and taught him knowledge,
and made known to him the way of
understanding? (40:12-14)

The idea of Yahweh's incomparability is implicit in these rhetorical questions; Yahweh is the source of all knowledge and wisdom; no one has instructed him or shown him the way of knowledge. In Isa. 44:7 the implication is that Yahweh alone has a knowledge of the future and, therefore, is the only one who can predict what is to come. This same idea is explicitly stated in Isa. 46:9 f., where Yahweh himself proclaims his incomparability. The ability to "declare the end from the beginning" is clear proof for Deutero-Isaiah that Yahweh is utterly distinct from the "gods", which are in reality the creation of man.

In the Old Testament passages examined above, we have observed how an emphasis on Yahweh's wisdom and power has led the prophet(s) to stress Yahweh's incomparability as well. The point at issue, however, is not the incomparability of Yahweh, but the fact that Yahweh can create whereas the idols cannot. It is Yahweh's wisdom and power, however, which enable him to create; hence, the implication is that the idols are weak and stupid. Thus, while the concern is not to emphasize Yahweh's incomparability it is the obvious conclusion to be reached in view of the comparison made between Yahweh and the idols. Turning to the passage on wisdom in Baruch we note also that the point which is stressed is not the incomparability of God but his wisdom and power as seen in connection with

his discovery of the way to knowledge and his activity as Creator. In focusing attention on God's wisdom and power, however, the author of Bar. 3:9-4:4 is led to assert God's incomparability. He is led to this conclusion by the statements made earlier in connection with the question of the accessibility of wisdom: no one but God has been able to discover the dwelling-place of wisdom.

Wisdom and the Created Works

The concern in this portion of the study will be to focus attention on the question of the personification of wisdom, as conceived by the author of Bar. 3:9-4:4; and to consider the background of this conception. It is not our aim to treat the complex question of origins;[1] to do so would extend the study beyond the prescribed limits of the dissertation. A considerable amount of space would be saved if one would be able to establish a working definition of the term personification; but this is in itself an essential part of the problem. The following points have already been observed in connection with the passage in Baruch: (1) Wisdom exists as an independent entity. (2) Wisdom was not created but discovered by God. (3) God searched out the whole way to knowledge and revealed this to Israel. (4) After this, Wisdom appeared on earth and moved

---

[1] Cf. Roland E. Murphy, "Assumptions and Problems in Old Testament Wisdom Research", CBQ XXIX/3 (July, 1967), pp. 110 ff.

about among men. For the author of Bar. 3:9-4:4, then, Wisdom is an object to be searched out and discovered.[1] It is something more than a poetic personification of an abstract quality. On the other hand, while Wisdom enjoys independent existence it is not clear that it is an ontological being alongside God in the cosmos. A consideration of the background of the material in Baruch may shed some light on the problem.

In dealing with the background of the material in Baruch the wisdom poem of Job 28 is important. Some common ground between Job 28 and the wisdom passage in Baruch was already noted in connection with the question of the inaccessibility of wisdom. The relationship does not end here, however; some affinity between the two passages can also be seen in respect to the question of wisdom and the creation of the world. The relevant material in Job 28 consists of the following verses:

> God discerns the way to it,
> and he knows its place.
> For he looks to the ends of the earth,
> and everything under the heavens he sees.
> When he made a weight for the wind,
> and meted out the waters by measure,
> when he made a statute for the rain,
> and a path for the thunder-bolts,
> then he saw it and took account of it,
> and established it, and also searched it out.
> (28:23-27)

In both Baruch and Job, then, a contrast can be seen between man, on the one hand, who, in spite of his determined striving

---

[1]The Greek reads:

after wisdom, is incapable of finding it, and, on the other hand, God who discovers wisdom by virtue of his own discerning powers. Moreover, a connection is made in both passages between God's discovery of wisdom and his activity as Creator. The temporal element in Job, however, is missing in Baruch. In Baruch it is merely stated that God who prepared the earth is also the one who found wisdom (Bar. 3:32) whereas in Job God's discovery of wisdom occurs during his creative activity in the heavens. Still this point of difference should not obscure the fact that in both passages wisdom is not a created being or object but something that exists in the cosmos, independent of God.[1] The verbs that appear in Job 28:27 are particularly significant in this respect. When God discovered wisdom he carefully took account of it, observing it accurately, recording it exactly (וַיְסַפְּרָהּ), and established it, i.e., set it up (וַיְכִינָהּ), and searched it out, explored it, examined it thoroughly (וַיְחָקְרָהּ). The verse seems to imply that God by contemplating and investigating wisdom is able to create the world and arrange it in accordance with what he observes.[2] God sets up wisdom, perhaps as a model, after which the world

---

[1] According to Ringgren, wisdom in Job 28 is hypostatized but not personified, "since the personal factors cannot be said to be especially stressed". While recognizing wisdom to be separate from God and independent, Ringgren nevertheless concludes: "But ultimately it is a question of nothing but the wisdom of God, being manifested in the creation" (op. cit., p. 95).

[2] Cf. Ringgren, loc. cit.

was created and the cosmic order established.[1] The concern in Job 28, however, is centered not so much on God's creative activity as on man's urgent striving after understanding.[2]

This urgent quest has been interpreted by a number of scholars to mean a concern to understand the mystery of creation, the divine wisdom by which God created and continues to regulate the universe.[3] But the wisdom which pervades and controls the world is beyond man's grasp.[4] Were the message in Job 28 to end here it would leave one in a state of hopelessness and despair. The passage concludes, however, with the statement: "And he [God] said to man: 'Behold, the fear of Yahweh, that is wisdom; and to turn from evil is understanding'" (28:28). Most commentators recognize this verse as a theological addition to the poem.[5] Wisdom being identified here with piety and morality is of a practical nature and remains within the grasp of man whereas the wisdom inquired about in verses 12 ff. has to do with the ordering of the cosmos and remains solely at God's disposal. S. Terrien is among the few scholars in recent times who defend the authen-

---

[1]Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, II, 88.

[2]Cf. Job 28:12-13,20-21.

[3]Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, II, 88; and also von Rad's article, "Some Aspects of the Old Testament World-View", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 158-159.

[4]This interpretation of wisdom is particularly attractive in the light of the speeches of Yahweh in Job 38.

[5]Pope, op. cit., p. 183.

ticity of verse 28. He does so by attempting to show the "inevitability" of the conclusion arrived at in the disputed verse.[1] The wisdom of verse 28 cannot be attained through any effort on the part of man. Like the wisdom of verses 24-27 it too may elude his grasp.[2] The position taken by Terrien, however, is not as convincing as the one endorsed by the greater number of scholars: verse 28 can be seen best as an attempt to show man a way out from the hopeless condition depicted in the preceding verses. Therefore, it is probably a later addition to the chapter.

The mood of gloom and despair in Job 28:1-27 is missing in Baruch precisely because the author identifies wisdom with the Torah. Hence, insofar as Israel is concerned, the wisdom discovered by God is accessible. Some consideration must be given to the question raised earlier: How are we to understand the reference to the wisdom God discovered? In view of the points of contact with the passage in Job it is possible to understand the figure of wisdom in Baruch in a similar way, namely, as the secret of creation known only to God. Before considering this suggestion any further two additional passages should be cited: Prov. 8:1-32 and Sir. 24:3-10.

The wisdom poem in Proverbs 8 consists of three parts:[3] (1) verses 1-21, (2) verses 22-31, and (3) verses 32-36. In

---

[1] The Book of Job, p. 1104.

[2] Ibid., p. 1105.

[3] I am following von Rad's analysis in Old Testament Theology, I, 447.

verses 1-21, Wisdom appears as a street preacher or a prophetess and cries out to all to give heed to her message (vss. 1-5). In no uncertain terms she makes her claim to truth. All her words are righteous and true; everyone who takes hold of her instruction will find knowledge (vss. 14-16). Wisdom's all-embracing claim to truth includes the knowledge by which kings reign and princes rule, and rulers make just decrees, etc. (vss. 14-16).

Wisdom introduces herself in verses 22-31 as the first of God's created works. Opinions differ as to the meaning of the figure Wisdom. One of the most highly disputed questions involves the translation of אמון in verse 30. The meanings offered range from "master workman" to "little child" or "darling" or "pet". In view of the various positions taken by scholars the explanation offered by von Rad seems plausible:

> It is much more likely that the controversial אמון in vs. 30 should be translated by "darling" or "pet", and that it came to be interpreted as "master workman" only under the pressure of later concepts, as they came to be expressed in the Wisdom of Solomon. Here in Proverbs the author of this poem is obviously only interested in maintaining that wisdom pre-existed before all Creation. In particular the relationship between her and the thing created is described as one of play.[1]

Wisdom in verses 32-36 resumes her role as a preacher, and in more urgent tones appeals to her hearers; to accept or reject her are matters of life and death.

The Wisdom who makes her ultimate appeal to man, then,

---

[1] Old Testament Theology, I, 447. For a detailed analysis of the problem see R.B.Y. Scott, "Wisdom in Creation: the Amon of Proverbs VIII, 30", VT X (1960), 213-223.

is the wisdom, which is closely associated with God in the creation of the world. The Wisdom that makes such colossal claims about possessing truth is the wisdom that is implicit in creation and, as von Rad says, is "none other than the secret of creation, instinct in the universe itself". In contrast to Job 28 the secret of creation is openly proclaimed. Wisdom, which contains the secret of the created order, is accessible to man; all are urged to take hold of her instruction. Wisdom, moreover, is confronted by a generation with a presumptuous world-view;[1] there is danger of one missing the call of Wisdom and, consequently, of bringing harm to oneself (cf. Prov. 1:21-23).

In the urgent appeals of Wisdom and in her claims to possess truth one can see some affinity with the wisdom passage in Baruch.[2] In the latter we find urgent appeals directed to the nation Israel instead of to the individual, but the same ultimate issues of life and death are held out to those who would embrace Wisdom; the call to obedience has the same note of urgency. Israel is in great danger of forfeiting the blessings accessible to her in the Torah. In view of the identification of wisdom with the Torah, the sage can also claim that Israel has possession of the truth, for God has disclosed to the nation the whole way of knowledge. In Baruch, then, the claims to ultimate truth are related to the divine revelation

---

[1] von Rad, "Some Aspects of the Old Testament World-View", p. 160.

[2] This will be dealt with further in the next chapter.

entrusted to Israel in the Torah.[1] In respect to their "basic attitude" or tenor, then, one can see some correspondence between Proverbs 8 and Baruch 3:9 ff.

When we turn to Sirach 24 we find the claims of Wisdom similar, in certain respects, to those in Proverbs 8. Ultimately Wisdom has her source in God; she is described as having come "forth from the mouth of the Most High" (vs. 3), and dwells in the clouds (vs. 4). She controls all creation (vs. 5), and claims a portion "in every people and nation" (vs. 6). In contrast to Baruch 3, as well as Job 28, Wisdom in Sirach 24 is a creature of God (vs. 8). A new thought is introduced in Sirach 24, namely, Wisdom's search for a dwelling-place. Before tabernacling in Israel Wisdom seeks lodging among all the nations of the earth, but none would embrace her, nor truly comprehend her (vs. 7). This colossal tragedy[2] forms the basis of Israel's unique claim to possess ultimate truth. God now commands Wisdom to make her dwelling-place in Israel (vs. 8). Later in the chapter Wisdom is identified with the Torah, the Mosaic legislation entrusted to Israel (vss. 23 ff.).

A correspondence in thought between Sirach 24 and Baruch 3, then, can be observed in the identification of wisdom with the Torah. Moreover, according to both passages, divine wisdom, or "the divine secret of the created order", is beyond

---

[1] See Chapter VI.

[2] Cf. Enoch 42: Wisdom searches in vain for a dwelling-place among men, and then returns to her place of dwelling in heaven.

the grasp of mankind in general but is accessible to Israel. For Sirach, however, Wisdom has come to tabernacle with Israel, because she was unable to find a place of lodging elsewhere among the nations of the world. By refusing to embrace Wisdom the nations have shut themselves out from divine revelation. In this respect one is able to observe a significant point of difference between Sirach and Baruch. In the latter Israel's exclusive claim to wisdom is not the result of the nations rejection of truth, but is based on God's choice of her as his people. In Baruch the nations or peoples search for wisdom but are unable to find it. Aside from this difference Sirach 24 and Baruch 3 are saying essentially the same thing: if the nations of the world desire divine revelation, then they must come to Israel, the nation to whom God has entrusted the Torah. In view of the similarity between Sirach and Baruch, we find no reason to exclude Bar. 3:38 from the original passage; it need not be considered a Christian interpolation but may be understood to express the view that any wisdom which the nations of the earth can hope to claim has its source in the Torah entrusted to Israel.[1]

Returning to the question raised earlier in regard to the figure of wisdom in Baruch, we note that wisdom, on the one hand, seems to come close to that of a divine plan according to which the world was created and by which it is regulated. On

---

[1]Cf. A.M. Dubarle, Les Sages d'Israël (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1946), p. 134: "Les divers paralleles ci-dessus excluent absolument que Bar. 3,38 soit une allusion à l'Incarnation, interpolée par une main chrétienne."

the other hand, it is difficult to insist on one single conception, in view of the statement of Wisdom's descent and activity among men. In verse 38 Wisdom seems to be something more than a cosmic principle; it seems to assume personal qualities, although this is not as evident in Baruch as it is in Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24. In Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24 Wisdom, as noted above, appears in the form of a person and proclaims her message with a sense of urgency whereas in Baruch the speaker throughout the passage remains the sage. Wisdom in Baruch, then, does not assume the personal qualities of the figure in Proverbs or Sirach. It is not necessary, therefore, to interpret verse 38 in strictly literal terms. Should one insist on doing so, then, for the sake of consistency, it would be necessary to attribute personal existence to the stars, on the basis of the qualities ascribed to them in verses 34-35.

In view of these difficulties,[1] we conclude that the author's concept of wisdom seems to fluctuate, on the one hand, between that of a cosmic principle by which the universe is regulated, and, on the other hand, that of a quasi-personal being.

---

[1]Cf. the statement of Murphy: "The meaning of the personification of wisdom is about as elusive as the origins" ("Assumptions and Problems in Old Testament Wisdom Research", p. 112).

CHAPTER VI

WISDOM AND THE TORAH

The material in this chapter will be presented under two main headings: (1) The relation of wisdom to the Torah, and (2) Wisdom and the Torah in connection with Israel's uniqueness. In our discussion of the relationship of wisdom to the Torah consideration will be given to the rewards derived from wisdom and the Torah, the consequence of forsaking wisdom and the Torah, and the identification of wisdom with the Torah. Under the second heading attention will be focused on Israel's unique relation with God, where the question of Israel's election will be treated in connection with the gift of wisdom, and Israel's unique place among the nations, where Israel's claim to truth will be examined.

WISDOM AND THE TORAH IN BARUCH

The material to be examined in this chapter of the study is based on Bar. 3:9-14 and 4:1-4, the introduction and conclusion of the wisdom passage. There is reason to believe that verses 10-13 were not a part of the original composition but were added at a time prior to the compilation of the book.[1]

---

[1]See Chapter I.

Our concern, however, is with the passage in its present form; these verses, therefore, will not be excluded from the study.

The relation of wisdom to the Torah. The message in Bar. 3:9 ff. begins with these words:

> "Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life;
> listen and learn wisdom!"

The sage addresses his message to the nation Israel. Verses 10-13 introduce the problem of the exile, and attempt to provide an explanation for Israel's misfortune: the nation has forsaken the "fountain of wisdom" and, consequently, must experience the folly of such a course (vs. 12). Had Israel walked in the "way of God", they would not have encountered this misfortune, but would have dwelt in peace forever (vs. 13). Therefore they are to pursue wisdom, and discover strength and understanding that they may receive life and peace (vs. 14).

In verses 10-13 we note three expressions which merit some consideration: The first expression is "the land of the enemy" (ἡ γῆ τῶν ἐχθρῶν) or "foreign country" (γῆ ἀλλοτρία). The nation Israel has been defiled through contact with the enemy on foreign soil. This concept of the land when placed alongside the statement in verses 24-25 raises some interesting questions. In the previous chapter we observed that the statement in verses 24-25 conceived the entire creation (including the earth) as God's possession. Are these views incompatible with each other? Or is it possible for one to conceive the earth as belonging to God and, at the same time,

to recognize a portion of it as the territory of the enemy, a land where one becomes defiled, etc.? Perhaps it is possible to do so. At the same time, we need not insist on absolute consistency, since there is reason to believe that the verses containing the latter view have come from another hand.

The second expression is "the fountain of wisdom" (ἡ πηγὴ τῆς σοφίας). This expression does not appear elsewhere in the passage. Instead we find references to wisdom's paths (τρίβος 3:21,23,31), or to the way (ὁδός) of wisdom, knowledge, or understanding (3:20,23,27,31,37).[1] The expression "the fountain of wisdom" can be interpreted in at least three ways: (a) as a simple periphrasis for wisdom,[2] (b) as a reference to God himself,[3] and (c) as a reference to the Torah.[4] The first interpretation understands wisdom as a beneficial fountain of life, i.e. the fountain is wisdom itself and not the source from which wisdom flows. The emphasis is on wisdom as an independent entity. The second interpretation conceives God as the source of wisdom. This is in accordance with the statements appearing elsewhere in the chapter, where it is emphasized that God alone discovered wisdom by his own understanding (3:32). In connection with this interpretation

---

[1] In Baruch the terms ἐπιστήμη, σύνεσις, σοφία and φρόνησις are used interchangeably. See Chapter III above.

[2] Cf. Penna, Baruch, p. 922.

[3] Cf. Kneucker, op. cit., p. 281.

[4] Cf. Bissell, op. cit., p. 487: "God himself or his commandments may be supposed to be meant".

we note some variant readings in the manuscripts. Instead of the reading "fountain of wisdom" the Ethiopic and Old Latin versions have "the fountain of life"; moreover, in the Ethiopic version the words τὸν κύριον are added. The passage then reads: "You have forsaken the fountain of life, the Lord".[1] Finally, we note the position which views the Torah as the source of wisdom. Later in the chapter wisdom is identified with the Torah. It is conceivable therefore that one could refer to the Torah as "the fountain of wisdom". But these interpretations, especially the last two, need not be considered mutually exclusive of each other. It is possible that the one responsible for verses 10-13 intended to include both or even all three meanings. The expression is ambigous and, for that reason, it is difficult to insist on one interpretation exclusive of the others.

The third expression to be considered is the phrase "the way of God", which seems to be a reference to the Torah. Throughout the rest of the passage on wisdom we note the phrase "the way of wisdom" or its equivalent, but never "the way of God". In the concluding section of the book of Baruch we find the expression "the ways of God's commandments" (4:13). One then, might see the phrase "the way of God" in parallel with the expression "the fountain of wisdom":

> You have forsaken the fountain of wisdom.
> Had you walked in the way of God
> you would be dwelling in peace forever.

---

[1] See Joseph Ziegler, Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae. ("Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum", XV: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 459.

The identification of wisdom with the Torah means, of course, that wisdom is no longer inaccessible; hence, the appeal goes forth to learn where wisdom can be found. The object of incomparable value, inaccessible to Israel's neighbors, has come to Israel in the form of the Torah (4:1-2).

Wisdom and the Torah in connection with Israel's uniqueness. God's gift of wisdom is none other than the Torah; it symbolizes his love for Israel and forms an appropriate expression of his choice of them as his people. No other nation is blessed with such wisdom as the nation Israel; and no other nation enjoys the relationship that Israel enjoys with God. In the Torah Israel has access to divine wisdom; this will insure her safety and salvation (4:1). The will of God has been revealed to Israel in a clear and an unambiguous form. Israel is not left in the dark to discern what God's purpose for her should be. The Torah is a light illuminating her path (4:2). In the Torah Israel has a knowledge of the things which please God, and this knowledge constitutes the source of her happiness (4:4). This unique gift, moreover, is the source of Israel's glory among the nations and gives her a desirable place under the sun (4:3). But there is a danger of Israel's forfeiting her glory and the priviledges accompanying it to an alien people. In view of this possibility the author closes his message with an appeal to remain faithful to the Torah and a reminder of Israel's unique blessings (4:2-4).

THE BACKGROUND OF THE MATERIAL IN BARUCH

The Relation of Wisdom to the Torah

The rewards derived from wisdom and the Torah. Contact between the wisdom passage in Baruch and the book of Deuteronomy has been observed earlier in connection with the question of the inaccessibility of wisdom.[1] Further correspondence can be seen in the sage's address to the nation Israel: "Hear, O Israel".[2] We find this form of address appearing in the book of Deuteronomy in a number of places; it seems to have been the traditional summons for calling the people to worship.[3] A similar formula appears in the book of Proverbs but with one difference: the instruction of the sage is never directed to the nation but is addressed instead to the individual.[4]

---

[1]Cf. Bar. 3:29-30 and Deut. 30:12-13.

[2]This has been observed by a number of scholars. See Kneucker, op. cit., p. 277.

[3]Cf. G. von Rad, Deuteronomy, translated by Dorothea Barton ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 63.

[4]The formula in Proverbs usually consists of the words "my son" (1:8,10,15; 2:1; 3:1,11,21; 4:10; 5:1; 6:1,20; 7:1; 19:27; 23:15,19,26; 24:13,21; 31:2). At times it occurs in the plural as "my sons" (4:1; 5:7; 6:24; 8:32). This typical introductory formula is quite old, being found also in the Egyptian Instructions. In the latter we find the formula in texts where the royal sage hands down his wise sayings to his student, or, in some cases, the old king to his son, who was designated to be the future ruler. Cf. Adolf Erman, The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians, translated by A.M. Blackman (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1927), pp. 54 ff.

In the Septuagint the expression "commandments of life" (ἐντολαὶ ζωῆς) is found only in Bar. 3:9.[1] It appears parallel with the term "wisdom" or "prudence" (φρόνησις). In the sapiential literature, especially in the book of Proverbs, a connection can be observed between the commandments of the sage and life, which results from giving heed to such commandments: "Let your mind hold fast my words; keep my commandments and live" (4:4; cf. 7:2).[2] A connection also may be seen in the book of Deuteronomy between the statutes and ordinances of Yahweh, and life resulting from the nation's obedience of them: "And now, O Israel, listen to the statutes and the ordinances which I am about to teach you to do, that you may live...." (4:1; cf. 8:1, etc.).

In Baruch the expression "the commandments of life" is closely related to the other rewards offered by wisdom. Those who seek after wisdom will have "length of days [μακροβιώις][3] and life," light for the eyes and lasting peace (3:14). Such

---

[1]See Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., I, 480.

[2]In the book of Proverbs the terms miswah, dabar, and torah occasionally occur, but not as a reference to the Mosaic legislation; they are to be understood instead as the teaching of the sage, resulting from his observation of certain "laws" operating in nature, human society, and human experience. So J. Fichtner concludes: "It can be proved with absolute certainty that the termini mentioned are never used with a legal significance (law, commandments) in the proverbs, but everywhere with a significance which is in the context of wisdom (direction, advice)". Cf. Die altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer israelitisch-jüdischen Ausprägung, Bei ZAW NO. 62, Giessen 1933, p. 83. This quotation was taken from von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 435.

[3]Literally, "length of life".

rewards are characteristic of the wisdom-teaching. Wisdom in Proverbs offers one long life, riches, and honor (Prov. 3:16); all her paths are paths of peace (Prov. 3:17); by wisdom one is able to walk securely (בֶּטַח ; Prov. 3:23). Wisdom also protects one from harm and danger (Prov. 3:23), keeps one free of anxiety (Prov. 3:24-26), and is a safeguard against the "strange woman" (Prov. 5:1-23; 6:20-35; 7:1-23). The passage Prov. 3:1 lists rewards similar to those in Baruch: "My son, do not forget my teaching...for length of days and years of life and peace will be added to you". Length of days, life, and peace, then, are the common rewards offered by wisdom. The expression "length of days and life" occurs also in Deuteronomy as a reward held out to those who observe the commandments of Yahweh:"...by loving Yahweh your God, by listening to his voice and by cleaving to him; for this is your life and your length of days."[1]

We can see then, a connection between wisdom and the Torah in the rewards offered, on the one hand, to those who pay heed to the teaching of the wise men[2] and, on the other hand, to those who observe the commandments of Yahweh. The blessings promised by the sage in Baruch, as well as in Proverbs, then, are comparable to those held out by the

---

[1]In Deuteronomy the reward is understood in less individualistic terms than in Proverbs; in this respect Deuteronomy is closer to the sense of the wisdom passage in Baruch.

[2]This is not confined to the wisdom material in Proverbs but may be seen elsewhere; for example, cf. Sir. 6:18-37; cf. also Ps. 119:165.

preacher (Moses) in Deuteronomy.[1]

The consequence of forsaking wisdom and the Torah. Common ground for wisdom and the Torah can be seen also in connection with the reference to Israel in exile. In Baruch it is explicitly stated that Israel's misfortune was the direct result of their forsaking the fountain of wisdom. The expression "the fountain of wisdom" calls to mind a number of statements in the book of Proverbs. There is only one instance in the book where the actual phrase occurs; in Prov. 18:4 the fountain of wisdom (מְקוֹר חָכְמָה) is said to be a "bubbling stream", and is found parallel with "the words of a man's mouth", which in turn are like "deep water". But elsewhere we note examples where wisdom or its equivalent appears in connection with the expression "the fountain of life". The teaching (torah) of the sage is "a fountain of life" which safeguards one from the pitfalls of death (13:14). Reverence for Yahweh[2] is a fountain of life which offers the same protection to the individual (14:27). Wisdom or prudence (שֵׂכֶל) is a fountain of life in contrast to folly, which is the correction of fools (16:22). In connection with the warnings against the "strange woman" we find additional associations

---

[1]Cf. Roland E. Murphy, "The Concept of Wisdom Literature", The Bible in Current Catholic Thought (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962), p. 52.

[2]Cf. Prov. 15:33, where reverence for Yahweh is said to be instruction in wisdom.

with the term "fountain". A man who indulges in extramarital sexual activity is like one who drinks water from a strange fountain. The man who possesses wisdom will drink water from his own cistern and remain faithful to the wife of his youth (5:15-19). Similarly we note in connection with the strange woman the warning in Prov. 9:18, "Do not drink from a strange fountain".[1]

The warnings against forsaking one's own fountain or against drinking water from a strange fountain direct us to the passage in Jeremiah where the prophet charges Israel with forsaking Yahweh: "For my people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me the fountain of living water to hew for themselves cisterns -- broken cisterns, which cannot hold water!" (Jer. 2:13). Verse 13 concludes the first major unit of the prophet's message. In the preceding verses stress is laid on the utter foolishness of Israel's apostasy. The prophet calls to mind Yahweh's love and kindness toward Israel in the days of her youth. Faithfully he led her through the wilderness into the promised land (2:6-7). But after the settlement she forsook Yahweh and turned to the worship of Baal (2:7). In view of Yahweh's love and goodness toward her Israel's apostasy is incomprehensible; it is utterly senseless and without precedent among the nations (2:11).

Returning to the passage Bar. 3:10-13 we note the

---

[1]This quotation is based on the Septuagint text, edited by A. Rahlfs; see Prov. 9:18c. This passage is not found in the Masoretic text.

statement that Israel's misfortune could have been averted had the nation walked "in the way of God". The expression "walk in the way of God" is similar to that found in Jeremiah where the meaning has to do with the observance of the commandments: "But this word I commanded them saying, 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God and you will be my people; and walk in all the way which I commanded you that it may be well with you'"(Jer. 7:23). We note also in the passage Jer. 7:23 the connection between the observance of the commandments and the welfare of the nation accompanying such observance. This same connection can be seen in Baruch where it is explicitly stated that Israel would have dwelt in peace had she walked in accordance with God's will. Similar passages in wording and in idea are to be found also in Deuteronomy: "In all the way which Yahweh your God commanded you you shall walk, that you may live, and that it may go well with you, and that you may lengthen the days in the land which you shall possess" (5:33).[1]

The primary concern of Bar. 3:10-13 is to provide an explanation for the exile and the misfortune accompanying it. In this respect one can also note some common ground with the book of Jeremiah. When the people ask for a reason for their misfortune they are told: "As you have forsaken me and served foreign gods in your land so you will serve strangers in a land that is not yours" (Jer. 5:19); and again in Jer. 9:12 we

---

[1]Cf. also Deut. 4:40; 5:16,29; 6:3,18; 12:25, and 22:7.

read: "...because you have forsaken my torah which I have set before you and have not obeyed my voice or walked in accord with it".[1] This is also the language and theology of Deuteronomy,[2] but we have no way of determining whether the author is alluding to Jeremiah or Deuteronomy. What he seems to be concerned with is to explain the misfortune of Israel, on the one hand, in language similar to Jeremiah or Deuteronomy and, on the other hand, to connect this explanation to the wisdom passage.

The identification of wisdom with the Torah. The identification of wisdom with the Torah forms the culmination of a process not easily defined.[3] We have been able to observe some common ground between wisdom and the Torah in respect to the rewards offered for obedience, and the misfortune following disobedience. This was seen particularly in connection with the wisdom-teaching in Proverbs and the paraenetic material in Deuteronomy. The purpose of this portion of the study is to call attention to several passages in the Old Testament where an orientation of the Torah toward wisdom takes place. Accord-

---

[1]Cf. also Jer. 16:10-13 and 22:8-9. In each case a question is asked concerning the reason for Israel's misfortune, and the answer is given that such came as a consequence of their forsaking Yahweh, or his torah, or covenant, and worshiped other gods.

[2]Cf. J. Philip Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy", JNES I (1942), 156-173.

[3]Cf. Murphy, "Assumptions and Problems in Old Testament Wisdom Research", p. 112.

ing to R.E. Murphy, the good life constitutes "the common denominator between observance of the law as conceived by Deuteronomy and the pursuit of wisdom preached by the wisdom writers".[1] Murphy sees this common denominator as the basis for the identification between wisdom and Torah.[2] In respect to the relationship between Deuteronomy and wisdom a number of suggestive articles have recently appeared. Among the most recent publications is the one by C.M. Carmichael, the purpose of which was "to demonstrate how in Deuteronomy there is evidence of a complex and subtle fusion of interests in law, history and wisdom".[3] The didactic intention of Deuteronomy has been recognized for quite some time by a number of scholars.[4] Carmichael's contribution is to be found in the specific examples[5] he cites which show how Deuteronomy uses both the past history of Israel and the wisdom-teaching (particularly the material corresponding to that found in Proverbs) to present

---

[1] "The Concept of Wisdom Literature", p. 52.

[2] Ibid.

[3] "Deuteronomic Laws, Wisdom, and Historical Traditions", JSS XII (1967), p. 206. Cf. also M. Weinfeld's "The Origin of Humanism in Deuteronomy", JBL XLIX (1961) 131-142 and J. Malfroy, "Sagesse et Loi dans le Deuteronomie", VT XV (1965).

[4] Cf. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, p. ii.

[5] Carmichael analyzes the laws dealing with the removal of landmarks (Deut. 19:14), and with false weights and measures (Deut. 25:13-16). He cites affinities with the wisdom instruction on ancient landmarks (Prov. 22:28; 23:10) and the maintenance of true weights and measures (Prov. 11:1; 16:11; 20:23); op. cit., p. 200.

instruction on important social, moral, and religious matters.[1] In respect to its subject matter, as well as its didatic tone and urgent appeals, then, a correspondence can be seen between Deuteronomy and the wisdom writings.[2]

Returning to the question of the identity of wisdom with the Torah we note in the passage Deut. 4:5-6 a close association between the two:

> Behold I have taught you statutes and ordinances as Yahweh my God commanded me that you should do them in the midst of the land which you are about to enter and take possession of. Observe them and do them for this will be your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the peoples, who will hear all these statutes and will say, "Surely, a wise and an understanding people is this great nation".[3]

In this passage we are able to note an orientation of the Torah toward wisdom. The revelation entrusted to Israel is conceived as "the embodiment of all wisdom".[4] Wisdom comes as a direct result of one's observance of the statutes and the ordinances. It is the nation, obviously, that is addressed and not the individual. These verses, von Rad states, can be understood "only as an exhortation to reinforce a recital of the law which has already been made".[5] In the Torah Israel has access to ultimate truth. Therefore, in order to be a wise and an understanding people they must put

---

[1] Carmichael, op. cit., p. 200.

[2] Cf. Murphy, "The Concept of Wisdom Literature", p. 50.

[3] Cf. also Ezra 7:25 where a foreign king refers to the Mosaic legislation as "wisdom".

[4] von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 49.

[5] Ibid.

this truth into practice.

This same orientation of the Torah toward wisdom can be observed in a number of the didactic poems in the Psalter. Our first example is found in Ps. 19:8-10,

> The torah of Yahweh is sound,
> refreshing the soul;
> The testimony of Yahweh is trustworthy,
> making wise the simple.
> The precepts of Yahweh are upright,
> rejoicing the heart;
> The commandment of Yahweh is bright,
> enlightening the eyes;
> The word of Yahweh is clear,
> enduring forever;
> The judgments of Yahweh are truth,
> they are righteous altogether.

The context of the passage falls into two parts: (1) Verses 1-7 consist of a hymn in praise of the Creator. The whole creation offers its praise to God, declaring his glory, acts, and knowledge throughout the earth. (2) Verses 8-15 form a second hymn, but this time the object of praise is the Torah. There is reason to believe that the two parts were composed by different authors.[1] In the second hymn the author in adoration of the Torah attributes to it a number of the qualities belonging to Yahweh.[2] The Torah has life-giving power, which enables it to revive the soul with new vitality; it is faithful; it can impart wisdom to the ignorant; it is upright and

---

[1]Cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, Psalmen ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament", XV/I; Wageningen/Niederlande: Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1960), I, 153 ff.

[2]Cf. Mowinckel, "Psalms and Wisdom", p. 216: "Ardour for the Law sometimes finds vent in a hymn to the Law of Yahweh, to which is now attributed nearly all the power-filled and saving qualities, for which the hymn used to praise Yahweh himself."

brings joy to the individual; it contains light and therefore can enlighten others; it is eternal; it contains truth; it is righteous. A number of these same qualities are ascribed to wisdom or closely associated with wisdom: wisdom contains healing powers which refresh one and lead one to life (Prov. 3:8; 4:22); the way of Wisdom is upright (Prov. 8:8); ultimate truth is to be found with Wisdom (Prov. 8:7); the words of Wisdom are righteous (Prov. 8:8). Some common ground between the Torah and wisdom can be seen also in the value placed on both.[1]

Psalm 119 offers further evidence of a correspondence between the Torah and wisdom. This can be seen in verses 97-100 in particular.

> How I love your torah!
> Throughout the day it is my meditation.
> Your commandment makes me wiser than my enemies,
> for it is ever with me.
> I am more prudent than all my teachers,
> for your testimonies are my meditation.
> I have more discernment than the elders,
> for your precepts I have observed.[2]

The study of the Torah makes one wise and prudent. But one must have understanding before he can discern Yahweh's instruction. Hence the prayer of the Psalmist throughout the poem is that Yahweh will teach him and grant him insight that he might attain the wisdom found in the Torah.[3]

---

[1]Cf. Ps 19:10 with Prov. 8:19; 24:13-24; and Ps. 19:11 with Prov. 8:18,21.

[2]Cf. also verses 104 and 130.

[3]Cf. verses 26-27,29,32,33-34,35, 64,66,68,73,108,125, 135,144,and 169.

Elsewhere in the Psalter one can see an orientation of the Torah toward wisdom in Ps. 37:30-31; 94:8,10-12; 111:8,10. The righteous man utters wisdom because the Torah is in his heart (Ps. 37:30-31). Yahweh teaches men knowledge out of his Torah (Ps. 94:8,10-12). Reverence for Yahweh and the observance of his Torah constitute the highest form of wisdom (Ps. 111:8,10).[1]

When we turn to the literature of later Judaism we are able to note an orientation of wisdom toward the Torah, leading to an identification of the former with the latter. This can be seen especially in Sirach, where personified wisdom is unequivocally identified with the Torah Moses commanded (Sir. 24:23).[2] Similarly, in Bar. 4:1 the wisdom which God discovered and revealed to Israel is the Torah. It would be a serious oversimplification, however, for one to conclude that because wisdom and the Torah are usually identified with each other they are understood to be exactly the same in every instance.[3] In Sirach wisdom encompasses an area beyond that treated in the Torah. This can be seen, for example, in the passages

---

[1]The plural object in the last part of verse 10 seems to imply that the psalmist has in mind the observance of the commandments.

[2]Cf. Rudolf Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1906), p. 221; cf. Deut. 33:4.

[3]Later Jewish thought ascribed to the Torah many of the features of wisdom, in particular, wisdom's role in the creation of the world. Cf. George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 266 ff.

which contain maxims on human behavior.[1] It is only in the areas, therefore, where wisdom and the Torah overlap that one is able to speak of an identification between the two, and hence, their being equivalent with each other.[2] In Baruch, after the author has identified wisdom with the Torah he seems to be concerned primarily with the latter; but this is not certain, for it is difficult to make a sharp distinction between the two.

Wisdom and the Torah in Connection with Israel's Uniqueness

Israel's unique relationship with God. In the previous chapter a tendency to stress the wisdom and power of God in connection with his activity as Creator was observed. Attention was called to the importance which these attributes have for the idea of God's incomparability. Where God's wisdom and power are emphasized in connection with his incomparability a reference to the theme of Israel's election can also be observed. The allusion to the election of Israel is found in Bar. 3:36-37:

---

[1] Cf. Sir. 20:1-7,13-14,29-31,etc.

[2] Cf. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p. 384: "Thus the identity of Law and wisdom results from the syllogism: wisdom = piety and morals; piety and morals = Law; wisdom = Law."

This is our God;
no other is to be compared to him.[1]
He searched out the whole way to knowledge
and gave her to Jacob his servant
and to Israel his beloved.

The reference to the election motif is not explicitly made, but in view of the statement made earlier by the author, in connection with the folly of the giants, one may infer that the author is alluding to the theme of Israel's election:

God did not choose [ἐξελέξατο] them,
nor did he give them the way of knowledge;
and they perished because they did
not have prudence;
they perished because of their folly.
(Bar. 3:27-28)

Here the idea of election appears in connection with God's gift of wisdom. When this statement is placed alongside the statement in verse 37, the contrast between the giants and Israel can be clearly seen.

Baruch 3:27	Baruch 3:37
οὐ τούτους ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς οὐδὲ	ἐξεῦρε πᾶσαν
ὁδὸν ἐπιστήμης	ὁδὸν ἐπιστήμης
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν Ιακωβ

By his choice of words, then, the author is saying that God has reserved the gift of wisdom for Israel his elect people.

The allusion to the election motif in Bar. 3:36-37 can be seen also in the author's reference to Jacob as God's servant (παῖς) and to Israel as his beloved (ἀγαπητός). The reference to Jacob (or Israel) as God's servant can be seen

---

[1]The RSV translates this phrase as follows: "no other can be compared to Him!"

especially in Deutero-Isaiah, and appears often in connection with the idea of Israel's election: "But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen" (41:8); "...you are my servant, I have chosen you" (41:9); "Behold my servant...my chosen" (42:1); "You are...my servant whom I have chosen" (43:10); "But now hear, O Jacob, my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen" (44:1); "Fear not, O Jacob, you are my servant" (44:21); "For the sake of my servant Jacob and Israel my chosen" (45:4). In Isa. 41:9; 42:1; 43:10 there is no mention of Israel but the context of each passage shows that the title "servant" is a reference to the nation. In all of the passages cited above the Septuagint translates the Hebrew word עֶבֶד by the term παῖς . Of special interest is the passage Isa. 44:2 in the Septuagint. It compares with Bar. 3:37 as follows:

Baruch 3:37	Isaiah 44:2[1]
Ιακωβ τῷ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ	παῖς μου Ιακωβ
καὶ Ισραηλ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ	καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος Ισραηλ,
ὑπ' αὐτοῦ	ὃν ἐξελεξάμην

The reference to Israel as God's "beloved", or the equivalent of this, also forms a part of the language associated with the idea of Israel's election. This may be seen in the passage Hos. 11:1, "When Israel was a child I loved him, and out of Eghpt I called my son". But the connection between God's love and his choice of Israel as his people is more clear-

---

[1]The Septuagint text differs from the Masoretic text in respect to the words καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος Ισραηλ . The latter has instead וְיִשְׂרָאֵל .

ly stated in Deuteronomy: "And because he loved your fathers and chose their descendants after them..." (4:37). The reference to God's love and his election of Israel appears alongside his mighty deeds in redeeming Israel from Egypt and in giving them the land promised to their forefathers (vs. 39). Together they form the basis for an appeal to observe Yahweh's statutes and ordinances (vs. 40). In Deut. 7:6-11 it is stated that God's election of Israel was not based upon their greatness for they were "the fewest of all peoples" (vs. 7), but upon his gracious love for them and his faithfulness to the promise made to their forefathers (vs. 8). The conclusion then follows that Israel"s obedience to the commandments should likewise be motivated by a love for Yahweh (vss. 9-11). Finally, we note in Deut. 10:14-15 the reference to God's love and his choice of Israel in connection with the idea of his ownership of the heavens and the earth. This is done in order to add emphasis to the fact of his gracious dealings toward his people, and forms the basis of an appeal for obedience.

The point at issue in each of these passages in Deuteronomy, however, is not the election of Israel, but the observance of the commandments in view of God's turning toward her. In Bar. 3:36-37 the election motif, as already observed, is only at best alluded to. At the same time, the implications which this allusion has for the author's message are not insignificant. Closely associated with the idea of Israel's election, one may even say that it is inseparable, is the concept

of her uniqueness. This does not mean that whenever Israel's election is alluded to one would also find a statement of her uniqueness; but that her uniqueness is the obvious conclusion one is led to make in view of her election. In Bar. 3:36-37 Israel's uniqueness is seen in connection with her relationship with a God who is incomparable in wisdom and power. While the uniqueness of Israel is not the point that is being stressed, one may infer from the statement of God's incomparability that this is the logical conclusion to be reached. Israel alone has full possession of the truth. This leads us to the consideration of another question, namely, Israel's distinct position among the nations.

Israel's unique place among the nations. Israel's distinct position among the nations can only be seen from a theological point of view, i.e., from the point of view of her election. This can be seen, for example, in II Sam. 7:23-24: "And who is like your people Israel...? You have established for yourself your people Israel to be your people forever...." One may even go a step further and say that Israel's distinctiveness is the result of her being chosen by a unique God. That this is the real point of the passage II Sam. 7:23-24 can be seen in the verse immediately preceding: "Therefore you are great...Yahweh; for there is none like you, and there is no God except you..." (vs. 22). The same point can be seen in Deut. 4:7: "What great nation is there that has a God so near to it as Yahweh our God...?" What is being

stressed in this verse is Israel's distinct relationship with Yahweh, and therefore her uniqueness. But as we noted above, this can only be said in view of Yahweh's uniqueness, or incomparability. The point at issue in this passage, however, is not a comparison between Yahweh and the gods of Israel's neighbors, but between Israel whose God is Yahweh, and the other nations. The basis for Israel's uniqueness, then, is to be found in her relationship with Yahweh.

This unique relationship with Yahweh, as we have had occasion to note already, came about through the revelation of the Torah. Thus one may also say that Israel's distinct position among the nations stems from the fact that she possesses Yahweh's statutes and ordinances: "And what great nation has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this torah which I am setting before you today" (Deut. 4:8). Here emphasis is given to the fact that Israel alone possesses the truth.[1] When the peoples surrounding her hear these statutes and ordinances they exclaim: "Surely a wise and an understanding people is this great nation" (Deut. 4:6).

The privileges accompanying the possession of God's revelation, however, do not come unconditionally. Israel's wisdom and understanding come as a result of her observance of the commandments (Deut. 4:5-6). To depart from the Torah then would mean to place in jeopardy her relationship with God, and hence her unique position among the nations: "The whole

---

[1]Cf. von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 49.

tenor of the paraeneses" writes von Rad, "is that Israel is in very great danger of missing Yahweh's call to her".[1] In Bar. 4:2-3 the danger of Israel forsaking the Torah seems imminent also:

> Turn, O Jacob, and take her;
> go toward the shining of her light.
> Do not give to another your glory,
> or to an alien people what is profitable to you.

In the Hebrew the word often translated as "glory" is כָּבוֹד. The same term has the meaning of "honor" and is generally understood to be derived from the idea of "weight", of "heaviness" and of "standing".[2] Thus it is said of Abraham that he was "very heavy" in cattle, silver and gold (Gen. 13:1) meaning, of course, that he was very wealthy, and hence a man of honor. Similarly, Jacob's possessions are his כָּבוֹד (Gen. 31:1) in the sense that they give him standing in the eyes of others. The same word is used in reference to Israel's leaders.[3] We find this term, above all, in connection with the manifestation of Yahweh's presence in the history of Israel, as well as in the natural realm; and its occurrence serves to add emphasis to his power and standing in the world, in view of his mighty deeds.[4] In Bar. 4:2-3 Israel's glory or honor is derived from her possession of truth. To Israel alone God

---

[1] Old Testament Theology I, p. 223.

[2] BDB, pp. 458-459.

[3] Cf. G. Henton Davies, "Glory", IDB, II, 401.

[4] Cf. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p. 239.

revealed "the whole way to knowledge". This way to knowledge is none other than the Torah. Without the Torah then, Israel would be deprived of her standing, her distinct position among the nations. Hence, to depart from the revelation entrusted to her would be utterly foolish.

Something must be said about the particularistic attitude of the wisdom passage in Baruch. In view of the author's thesis that Israel alone has possession of the truth, one might be tempted to consider the passage as nothing more than an arrogant display of "religious chauvinism".[1] Such a conclusion would not be entirely unwarranted in the light of what Jewish particularism had often lead to. It is common knowledge that Jewish particularistic tendencies at times gave rise to a self-glorifying nationalism.[2] This in turn contributed toward the development of an uncharitable and intolerant attitude toward the non-Jewish communities. Jewish exclusiveness was at times motivated by a spirit of contempt for the "Gentiles".[3] But to focus attention solely on these aspects would be misleading and would overlook the fact that it was the particularistic spirit that held the Jewish religion together during times of crises.[4]

---

[1]Cf. Labuschagne, op. cit., p. 150.

[2]Cf. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 430.

[3]Cf. J. Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 403 f.

[4]Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity (London: S.P.C.K., 1941), p. 116.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

An examination of the literary and theological background of the wisdom passage in Baruch (3:9-4:4) has led to the following conclusions: The passage on wisdom did not originally belong to the present book of Baruch, nor did it form a portion of the presumed proto-Baruch. Evidence on the basis of language and style, differing viewpoints, and different subject matter indicates that the wisdom passage, in all probability, emanated from another hand. It was written by an author about whom we know nothing. Neither is it possible to identify the individuals responsible for the other portions of the book, namely, the confessions and prayers (1:15-3:8), and the poems treating the desolation and restoration of Jerusalem (4:5-5:9). The introductory verses (1:3-14) were probably composed by a redactor, who was concerned to provide the confessions and prayers with a historical setting, as well as to emphasize the liturgical purpose of the material. Each major division of the book (1:15-3:8, 3:9-4:4, and 4:5-5:9) shows evidence of further composition. It is no longer possible, however, to determine how many hands were involved in the final form of the book.

The original form of the wisdom passage contained no

reference to Israel in exile. The material in Bar. 3:10-13 can be understood best as an attempt to adapt the wisdom passage to the general setting depicted elsewhere throughout the book.

Insofar as a date for the wisdom passage is concerned, the conclusions reached can be at best only tentative. Since there is reason to believe that the wisdom passage enjoyed independent circulation prior to the time when it was added to the book, a distinction was made, on the one hand, between the date of its composition and, on the other hand, the time when it was joined to the other materials in the book. The final form of the book of Baruch probably took shape in the early part of the first century A.D. While an earlier date -- some time in the first century B.C. -- is possible, it seems less probable that the book was compiled in the years following the Roman destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). The main evidence for dating the materials consists of the literary parallels between Bar. 1:15-3:8 and Dan. 9:5-19, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, Bar. 5:1-9 and Ps. of Sol. 11:1-9.

Since the redactor of Bar. 1:15-3:8, in all probability, drew material from the book of Daniel, the earliest possible date for the former would be c. 150 B.C. The material in Bar. 4:5-5:9 was probably used by the author of Psalm of Solomon 11. Since the probable date of the latter is c. 60 B.C., the latest possible date for Bar. 4:5-5:9 was probably c. 70 B.C. The date for the compilation of the book, then, was probably in the first century B.C. or the early part of the first century A.D.

The dating of the final form of the book in the years following the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 seems less probable, moreover, because of the favorable attitude toward foreign rulers displayed in the introductory verses (1:10-14), on the one hand, and the lack of specific references to the destruction of the city and the temple, on the other hand.

While the evidence available is not conclusive, there is reason to believe that the wisdom passage was composed in the early part of the second century B.C. The author made use of material from the book of Job, as well as from the book of Deuteronomy and the book of Genesis. It seems that the author was also familar with the late portions of the book of Isaiah, as well as the book of Sirach. The identification of wisdom with the Torah, moreover, is a feature not found in the Old Testament (Masoretic tradition), but is common in the literature of later Judaism. These facts seem to indicate a date not earlier than the second century B.C. The tone of the passage, as well as the claims made by the author -- wisdom is the exclusive possession of Israel -- seems to make sense in the early period of the Maccabean struggles, i.e.,at a time prior to the outbreak of a military conflict between the Jews and the Seleucid powers.

An examination of the theological background of the wisdom passage was accomplished by means of three themes, namely, the inaccessibility of wisdom, wisdom and Creation, and wisdom and the Torah. The thesis advanced by the author may be summarized in the following manner: the peoples of the earth,

in spite of their determined striving after knowledge, have not discovered the way to wisdom. Wisdom dwells in a place inaccessible to man. Only God, by virtue of his own discerning powers, knows the way to wisdom. Knowing this, he disclosed it to Israel, his elect people. The wisdom given to Israel is the Torah, which endures forever.

In the formulation of his message, the author drew material from several Old Testament books, namely, Genesis, Deuteronomy, Job, and probably Isaiah (i.e., Deutero-Isaiah). Insofar as the basic attitude of the passage is concerned, the wisdom passage in Baruch can be understood best in the context of several passages, namely, Job 28, Proverbs 8, and Sirach 24. Each passage differs considerably from the other, in respect to particular details. But common ground can be observed in the general concern of each passage, namely, the question of the accessibility of wisdom. Wisdom is found in one's fear of Yahweh, or one's obedience to Wisdom's call, or one's observance of the Torah.

The background for the thesis in Baruch -- wisdom is found only in Israel -- can be seen in the Old Testament passages which compare Israel's wisdom with that of their neighbors. Three examples were selected from the Old Testament, namely, Joseph, Solomon, and Daniel. In each example the wisdom displayed by the Israelite overshadowed the wisdom of the foreigners. In the Joseph narrative, Joseph appears as an ideal administrator, endowed with unusual gifts. His wisdom and discernment stand out in contrast to the Egyptian counsel-

ors, who fail to meet the requests of the Pharaoh. Solomon's wisdom is explicitly said to be superior to the wisdom of the men of the ancient Near East. Daniel, somewhat like Joseph, is an ideal sage in the court of a foreign monarch, who, because of his wisdom, is able to save the lives of the Babylonian wise men by meeting the demands of the king. The concern in each example, however, was not to focus attention on the individual, for the wisdom found in Joseph, Solomon, or Daniel, is seen not as an inherent human quality but as a special endowment of God. Hence, the success of Joseph and Daniel in the court of a foreign king, as well as the reputation of Solomon throughout the neighboring countries, is told in order to glorify the God of Israel.

In the prophetic attacks against foreign wisdom, or foreign wise men, the counselors and leaders of foreign nations are regarded as fools because they attempt to chart a course in defiance of Yahweh. The craftsmen engaged in the manufacturing of idols, as well as those who worship idols, are without understanding, since the idols they worship are stupid and weak.

In the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, as well as that of later Judaism, an interest in God's creative activity comes to the fore. Wisdom is seen as an attribute closely associated with God's power. In Baruch the wisdom and power of God, in connection with his creative activity, constitute important factors for the idea of God's incomparability. There is reason to believe that the author of the wisdom passage in Baruch was familar with Isaiah 40. In the latter, the wisdom

and power of God appear in connection with his activity as Creator; moreover, it is God's creative activity which makes him distinct from the idols and, therefore, incomparable.

An interesting feature in Baruch was observed in the connection made between wisdom and the history of Israel. In the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, wisdom operates within the framework of a theology of creation, having no relation to the history of the nation Israel. In Baruch, however, wisdom is identified with the Torah, and is seen, consequently, as a gift entrusted to the nation. The gift of wisdom appears, moreover, in connection with the theme of Israel's election. Hence, there is established in Baruch a relationship between Israel's history and wisdom. Wisdom now has to do with the nation, the elect people of God, whereas in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament the concern was centered around man in general.

The identification of wisdom with the Torah means that wisdom is accessible to Israel. The relationship between wisdom and the Torah is not a feature peculiar to Baruch nor is it uncommon in the literature of later Judaism. In the Old Testament one can see already a tendency in this direction. This was observed in the book of Deuteronomy and in the didactic psalms of the Psalter. Here an orientation of the Torah toward wisdom was noted. It is not only a question of wisdom moving in a direction toward divine revelation, then, but also the Torah moving in a direction toward wisdom. The statutes and ordinances given to Israel, when observed, make them a wise and

an understanding people.

The wisdom and discernment derived from the Torah is what makes Israel distinct from the nations surrounding her. The uniqueness of Israel was observed in Baruch in connection with the question of God's incomparability and his election of them as his people. As an expression of his love for them and his choice of them as his people, God revealed to Israel the whole way to knowledge. Israel's unique relationship with God and her possession of wisdom are the factors which make the nation distinct from all the surrounding peoples. The unique relationship with God, as well as the possession of wisdom, however, are privileges which can be forfeited through disobedience. The distinctness of the nation, therefore, can be preserved only as Israel adheres faithfully to the Torah.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

André, L.E. Tony. Les Apocryphes de L'Ancien Testament. Florence: Osvald Paggi, 1903.

Augé, Ramir Dom. Daniel. Lamentacions. Baruch. Lletra de Jeremias. ("La Biblia", vol. XV, part II.) Monestir de Montserrat, 1954.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Baumgartner, Walter. "The Wisdom Literature", The Old Testament and Modern Study. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961. Pp. 211-237.

Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament. Vol. I Fifth edition. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publishers, 1959.

Bevan, Anthony Ashley. "Book of Baruch", Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. I. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1889. Pp. 492-494.

_____. A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1892.

Bewer, J.A. "The River Sud in the Book of Baruch", The Journal of Biblical Literature, XLIII (1924), 226-227.

Bissell, Edwin Cone. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with Historical Introductions, A Revised Translation, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs (eds.). A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

Buhl, Frants. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Translated by John MacPherson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.

Carmichael, C.M. "Deuteronomic Laws, Wisdom, and Historical Traditions", Journal of Semitic Studies, XII (1967), 198-206.

Charles, R.H. Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments. New York: Henry Holt and Co., n.d.

_____. The Book of Daniel. ("The New Century Bible".) Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, n.d.

Charles, R.H. and W.O.E. Oesterley. "Baruch", Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. III. Chicago, London, Toronto: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1956. Pp. 156-157.

Cheyne, T.K. Job and Solomon or the Wisdom of the Old Testament. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.

_____. "Baruch", Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T.K. Cheyne, and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. I. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899. P. 491.

Cornill, Carl H. Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen. Fourth edition, completely revised. Freiburg and Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J.C.B. Mohr, 1896.

Davies, G. Henton. "Glory", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. Vol. II. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 401-403.

Davies, T. Witton. "Book of Baruch", The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia. Edited by James Orr, et al. Vol. I. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957. Pp. 407-410.

de Menasce, P.J. Daniel. ("La Sainte Bible".) Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1954.

Dion, Hyacinthe-M. "Yahweh, Dieu de Canaan, et la terre des hommes", Canadian Journal of Theology. XIII/4 (Oct. 1967), 233-240.

Driver, S.R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, ("The International Critical Commentary".) Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.

Dubarle, A.M. Les Sages d'Israël. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1946.

Duesberg, H. et I. Fransen. Les Scribes Inspires: Introduction anx Livres Sapientiaux de la Bible. Revised edition. Belgium: Éditions de Maredsous, 1966.

Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by J.A. Baker. 2 vols. ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961, 1967.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament, An Introduction: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Engnell, I. "'Knowledge' and 'Life' in the Creation Story", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 103-119.

Erman, Adolf. The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians. Translated by A.M. Blackman. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1927.

Ermoni, V. "Baruch", Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique. Edited by A. Vacont, E. Mangerot, and E. Amann. Vol. II. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1932. Cols. 437-441.

Ewald, Heinrich. The History of Israel. Translated by J. Estlin Carpenter. Vol. V. Second edition. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880.

Feine, Paul, Johannes Behm, and Werner Georg Kümmel. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A.J. Mattill, Jr. Fourteenth revised edition. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Ferrar, W.J. The Uncanonical Jewish Books: A Short Introduction to the Apocrypha and the Jewish Writings. London: S.P.C.K., 1918.

Fohrer, Georg. "Baruch", Calwer Bibellexikon. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959. P. 127.

_____. Das Buch Hiob. Gütersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963.

Fritzsche, Otto Fridolin. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testament. Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1851.

Gelin, A. Jérémie. Les Lamentations. Le Livre de Baruch. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1951.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Baruch in Rabbinical Literature", The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, et al. Vol. II. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1902. Pp. 448-449.

Goodenough, E.R. An Introduction to Philo Judaeus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Goodspeed, E.J. The Story of the Apocrypha. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Gray, John. I & II Kings ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Harwell, R.R. The Principal Versions of Baruch. New Haven: Yale University, 1915.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897.

Heinisch, P. "Die Entstehung des Buches Baruch", Theologie und Glaube XX (1928), 696-710.

Horn, Siegfried H. "Sivan", Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary. Edited by Don F. Neufeld et al. ("Commentary Reference Series", vol. VIII.) Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960. P. 1022.

Hyatt, James Philip. "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy", The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, I (1942), 156-173.

_____. Introduction to and Exegesis of the Book of Jeremiah. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. V. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1956.

Iranyi, L.A. "Book of Baruch", New Catholic Encyclopedia. Edited by William J. McDonald, et al. Vol. II. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. Pp. 138-139.

James, M.R. "Apocrypha", Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. I. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899. Pp. 249-261.

Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. Translated by Ralph Marcus. ("The Loeb Classical Library".) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Kalt, E. Das Buch Baruch. ("Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments", vol. VII, part 3/4.) Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.

Kaufmann, K. "Wisdom", The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, et al. Vol. XII. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1902. Pp. 537-538.

Keil, Carl F. Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments. Third edition. Frankfurt: Verlag von Heyder & Zimmer, 1873.

_____. C.F. The Book of the Prophet Daniel. Translated by M.G. Easton. ("Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament".) Edingburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Kissane, Edward J. The Book of Job. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1946.

Kittel, Rudolf. Die Psalmen Salomos, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Vol. II. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1900.

_____. (ed.). Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.

Kneucker, J.J. Das Buch Baruch: Geschichte und Kritik, Übersetzung und Erklärung auf Grund des wiederhergestellten hebräischen Urtextes. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1879.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner (eds.). Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953.

König, Eduard. Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen Alten Testaments. Bonn: Eduard Weber's Verlag, 1893.

Kraeling, E.G. The Book of the Ways of God. London: S.P.C.K., 1938.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. Psalmen. ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament", XV/I.) Wageningen/Niederlande: Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1960.

Kraus, Paul. "Baruch-Buch", Encyclopaedia Judaica: das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Jakob Klatzkin, I. Elbogen, et al. Vol. III. Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1929. Cols. 1123-1124.

Labuschagne, C.J. The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament. ("Pretoria Oriental Series", vol. V.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Eighth edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1929.

Lindblom, J. "Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 192-204.

Malfroy, J. "Sagesse et Loi dans le Deuteronomie", Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965).

Marshall, J.T. "Book of Baruch", A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings, et al. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. 251-254.

Mayer, Rudolf. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. München: Mas Hueber Verlag, 1967.

McKane, William. Prophets and Wise Men. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965.

McKenzie, J.L. "The Literary Characteristics of Gen. 2-3", Myths and Realities: Studies in Biblical Theology. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1963. Pp. 146-181.

_____. "Baruch", Dictionary of the Bible. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965. Pp. 81-82.

Metzger, Bruce M. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy. Translated by J. Rabbinowitz. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

Montgomery, J.A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. ("The International Critical Commentary".) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Psalms and Wisdom", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 205-204.

Murphy, Roland E. "The Concept of Wisdom Literature". The Bible in Current Catholic Thought. Edited by John L. McKenzie. Herder and Herder, 1962. Pp. 46-54.

_____. Introduction to the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1965.

_____. "Assumptions and Problems in Old Testament Wisdom Research", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIX/3 (July, 1967), 101-112.

Noth, Martin. "Die Bewährung von Salomos 'Göttlicher Weisheit'", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. P. 232.

_____. The History of Israel. Translated by R.R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1960.

Oesterley, W.O.E. The Books of the Apocrypha: Their Origin, Teaching and Contents. London: Robert Scott, 1915.

_____. The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity. London: S.P.C.K., 1941.

_____. An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.

Penna, A. Introduction and notes on the book of Baruch, La Sacra Bibbia. Vol. II. Italy: Marietti Ed. Ltdl., 1963.

Pesch, W. "Die Abhängigkeit des 11. salomonischen Psalms vom letzen Kapitel des Buches Baruch", Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft LXVII (1956), Pp. 251-263.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. "Edomitic Wisdom", Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, III-IV (1926-7), 13-25.

_____. History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Pope, M.H. Job. ("The Anchor Bible", vol. XV.) Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

Porteous, Norman W. "Royal Wisdom", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 247-261.

_____. Daniel: A Commentary. ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Pritchard, James B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Second edition. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. 2 vols., seventh edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.

Rankin, O.S. Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.

Reusch, F.H. Erklärung des Buches Baruch. Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1853.

Ringgren, H. Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. Lund: H. Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947.

Robert, A. "Littéraires (Genres)", Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplement. Edited by Henri Cazelles. Vol. V. Paris: Libraire Letouzey et Ane, 1957. Pp. 406-422.

Robinson, Theodore H. The Poetry of the Old Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1960.

Rosenthal, Franz. A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Second revised printing. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963.

Rothstein, W. Baruch, Das Buch. Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Vol. I. Tübingen: Berlag von T.C.B. Mohr, 1921.

Rowley, H.H. The Growth of the Old Testament. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

Russell, D.S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Rylaarsdam, John Coert. Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946.

Schmid, Hans Heinrich. Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: Eine Untersuchung zur altorientalischen und israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Div. II, Vol. III. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.

_____. "Apocrypha", The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, et al. Vol. I. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1949. Pp. 212-225.

Scott, R.B.Y. "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel", Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum", vol. III.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 262-279.

_____. "Wisdom in Creation: the Amon of Proverbs VIII,30", Vetus Testamentum, X (1960), 213-223.

_____. Proverbs. Ecclesiastes. ("The Anchor Bible", XVIII.) Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

Sellin, D. Ernst. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923.

_____. Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, ("Kommentar zum Alten Testament" vol. XII.) Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner School, 1929.

Skinner, John. Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah. Cambridge: The University Press, 1961.

Smart, James D. History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.

Smend, Rudolf. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1906.

Steinmann, Jean. Daniel. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1961.

Stoderl, W. Zur Echtheitsfrage von Baruch 1-3,8. Münster in Westf.: Druck der Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1922.

Strack, H.L. Einleitung in das Alte Testament einschliesslich Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen mit eingehender Angabe der Literatur. Fourth edition, entirely revised. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.

Tedesche, S. "Book of Baruch", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G.A. Buttrick et al. Vol. I. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 362-363.

Terrien, Samuel. Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Job. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. III, New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954.

_____. Job: Poet of Existence. New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1957.

Thackeray, H. St. John. "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", The Journal of Theological Studies, vol. IV (1902), 245-266 and 578-585.

_____. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909.

_____. The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins. Second edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.

Toy, Crawford H. "Book of Baruch", The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, et al. Vol. II. New York: Funk and Wagnals Company, 1902. Pp. 556-557.

_____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs. ("The International Critical Commentary".) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

van der Born, A. "Baruch", Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible. Translated and adapted by Louis F. Hartman, et al. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963, Cols. 210-211.

Vatke, W. Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Bonn: Verlag von Emil Strauss, 1886.

von Rad, Gerhard. Genesis. Translated by John H. Marks. ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

_____. Old Testament Theology. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. Vol. I. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

_____. Deuteronomy. Translated by Dorothea Barton. ("The Old Testament Library".) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

_____. "Some Aspects of the Old Testament World-View", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by Rev. E.W. Trueman Dicken, D.D. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. Pp. 144-165.

_____. "Job XXXVIII and Ancient Egyptian Wisdom", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by Rev. E.W. Trueman Dicken, D.D. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. Pp. 281-291.

_____. "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by Rev. E.W. Trueman Dicken, D.D. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. Pp. 292-300.

_____. "The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by Rev. E.W. Trueman Dicken, D.D. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. Pp. 79-93.

Wambacq, B.N. Jeremias, Klaagliederen, Baruch, Brief van Jeremias. ("De Boeken van Het Oude Testament".) Roermond en Maaseik: J.J. Romen & Zonen-Uitgevers, 1957.

_____. "L'unité littéraire de Baruch 1:1-3:8", Sacra Pagina Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, XII (1959), 455-460.

_____. "Les prières de Baruch (1,15-2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)", Biblica, XL (1959), 463-475.

_____. "L'unité du livre de Baruch", Biblica, XLVII (1966), 574-576.

Weinfeld, M. "The Origin of Humanism in Deuteronomy", The Journal of Biblical Literature, XLIX (1961) 131-142.

Weiser, A. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Second edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.

Whitehouse, O.C. The Book of Baruch, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Edited by R.H. Charles. Vol. I. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.

Whybray, R.N. Wisdom in Proverbs. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965.

Ziegler, Joseph. Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae. ("Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum", vol. XV.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

Zimmerli, Walter. "The Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology", Scottish Journal of Theology, XVII (1964), 146-158.

BIOGRAPHY

Joseph John Battistone was born on July 3, 1939 in New Britain, Connecticut. He received his secondary education at South Lancaster Academy in South Lancaster, Massachusetts, and at Thunderbird Academy in Scottsdale, Arizona, graduating from the latter in June of 1957. On August 9, 1960 he married Adrienne Louise Hussong. The following year he received his B.A. degree from La Sierra College in Arlington, California. He received his M.A. degree cum laude from Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan in June of 1963. The following year he was enrolled at Harvard Divinity School as a special student. In August of 1964 he received the B.D. degree magna cum laude from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Berrien Springs, Michigan. Following graduation he was assigned a parish in the Arizona Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, where he served as a pastor of two small churches from September of 1964 through August of 1965. In September of 1965 he began his graduate studies at Duke University. He was awarded a scholarship of tuition and fees during the school year of 1966-1967, and a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellowship for the year 1967-1968. In September of 1968 he will join the faculty of Andrews University as an instructor in the undergraduate faculty of Religion.